

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 583.

PUBLISHED IN
JANUARY 1950.

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.1.

1950

***“Now
she insists
on
helping us”***



Crippled, out of work, utterly tired of life, she knocked at the door of a Salvation Army Hostel. Matron took her in, later giving her a case of needles, wool, cotton and other things to sell. In 12 months she was not only paying her way but had saved £20 in the Post Office. And then—she *insisted* on giving £10 of her savings towards a radio that was badly needed by the Hostel. She's a very happy person now, and life at last has a meaning for her.

We are continually dealing with such cases in our hostels. We know we could still do more. To keep a man or woman for a month costs £10. More funds, and more hostels, are needed. We already have the plans; will you help us—by donation or legacy—to find the money? Please send a gift, marked “Hostels”, to General Albert Orsborn, C.B.E.

101, QUEEN VICTORIA ST., LONDON, E.C.4.

—WHERE THERE'S NEED . . . —

The Salvation Army

Printed in Great Britain by WILLIAM CLOWES & SONS, Limited, London and Beccles

CONTENTS

OF

No. 583.—JANUARY 1950.

ART.	PAGE
1. THE COURSE OF CONSERVATIVE POLITICS. By The Viscount Hinchingbrooke, M.P. - - - -	1
2. BRITAIN'S CONTRIBUTION TO HER OWN FOOD SUPPLY. By The Viscount Bledisloe, P.C., G.C.M.G., K.B.E., M.R.A.C. - - - -	10
3. COUNTING BRITAIN'S BIRDS. By Sydney Moorhouse	23
4. COMPLICITY IN AGGRESSION: A PROBLEM IN INTERNATIONAL LAW. By G. F. Hudson - - - -	36
5. BERNARD SHAW'S ORIGINS. By R. F. Rattray, Ph.D. - - - -	46
6. CHEKHO-SLOVAKIA: FORMERLY, YESTERDAY, AND TO-DAY. By Sir Raymond Beazley, D.Litt. - -	62
7. ASIAN NATIONALISM. By Sydney D. Bailey - -	73
8. ENGLISH ENTERTAINERS IN THE MIDDLE AGES. By Kenneth Hare - - - -	87
9. DISRAELI AND THE TWO NATIONS. By Robert Hamilton - - - -	102
10. POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN SOUTH AFRICA. By Michael Vane - - - -	116
SOME RECENT BOOKS - - - -	128

Dictionary of National Biography—Spain, 1923-1948—The Lamp of Memory—Colonial Civil Servant—Correspondence of Emily, Duchess of Leinster (1731-1814)—Craigavon: Ulsterman—A Life of John Keats—Piero della Francesca—The Tragedy of Socialism—Fifty Years' March. The Rise of the Labour Party—Everyman's Encyclopædia—The Drawings of W. Curtis Green, R.A.—W. E. Henley—The Two Constitutions—England, Yesterday and To-day—The Canticle of the Rose—European History 1648-1789—Home Ground—Madame Récamier—Old Vic Saga.

CONTENTS

No. 581.—JULY 1949.

1. The Course of Conservative Politics	279
2. Pakistan	298
3. Neutrality in War	312
4. Shakespear as Seen To-day	320
5. Who Secured the Suez Canal Shares?	336
6. The Queen of the West	348
7. Old English Newspapers	360
8. Swans and Other Things	371
9. Bulgaria: Formerly, Yesterday, and To-day	380
10. Thoughts about Coal	390
Some Recent Books	405

No. 582.—OCTOBER 1949.

1. 'Où va la France?'	419
2. Changes in Shipping	432
3. Time for Thought in Italy	448
4. White Australia	460
5. The Cedar of Lebanon	471
6. Crime, Delinquency, and Punishment	483
7. The Real Tennyson	495
8. Old Names, Old Numbers	508
9. Radio in the United States and Canada	520
10. Spain: Loaded Dice at Lake Success	537
Some Recent Books	554

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW is published in January, April,
July, and October.

Price Thirty-one Shillings and Fourpence per Annum, *post free*.

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 583.—JANUARY 1950

Art. 1.—THE COURSE OF CONSERVATIVE POLITICS.

DEVALUATION—THE FAILURE OF SOCIALISM

WE are witnessing in these weeks nothing less than the failure of the Socialist experiment. A theory is crashing in ruins. Fifty years ago some arrogant intellects decided that the British way of life could be planned by State action. In the last four years for the first time this theory has been invested with full administrative power, and has been prosecuted with great intensity. Unfortunately for the Socialists, though fortunately for those Conservatives and Liberals who believe in freedom, the nations in the world outside on whom we depend for food, raw materials, and markets for our merchandise are not taking to this theory. They are saying we are a country which fits in less and less with the free world trading system which is wanted. They do not respect this Government of political planners. They do not respect what planning brings, a community one-half in chains, the other half falsely bribed. They are saying we are impoverishing ourselves by the system and that by living beyond our means we are trying to make ourselves believe we are not impoverished. They have therefore written down the value of our currency. It would be wrong to think that Sir Stafford Cripps wrote it down. He merely followed suit. Devaluation was the recognition of a fact, the fact of overseas distrust. We can invest it with all the attributes of Dunkirk. We can say it shortens our communications, or that it restores reality, or that it gives us a fresh opportunity. But we cannot say it was a victory, not even for our exports. It was a major defeat. It was the defeat of a false British economic theory. It was the collapse of the idea that British planning can embrace our world suppliers and our world markets. It could never be so. We never had the moral or physical authority to wrap the world round with our planning, and the world has found us out.

Vol. 288.—No. 583.

2 THE COURSE OF CONSERVATIVE POLITICS

Devaluation is not only a defeat. It is a red warning light. Unless it is followed up by more adequate measures of economy than those taken at the time of writing the dangers are frightful. There will be further devaluations and after that we may go the way of Germany and Austria and other countries after the First World War. The individual's independence will go because his savings will disappear. The professional and business classes will be wiped out. Nothing will be left but the political controllers and the masses who are enchained to them. We must not forget that it was devaluation and inflation that made way for Hitler and his minions. These things can happen here. The early return of a Conservative Government is imperative if these processes are to be effectively arrested.

The position of Britain after two wars and four years of Socialism is that our country is not only greatly impoverished but terribly hampered by legislation and control in all its efforts to get itself out of impoverishment. There is no example in all history of any nation having achieved prosperity except by private initiative and personal reward. On the contrary, from the days of the Decline of Rome to Stalinist Russia there are many examples of the poverty and misery caused by the State taking tyrannical control of its citizens. The methods of Socialism can never create wealth. They can only distribute the wealth that private enterprise has formerly created. More than that, they act as a positive brake on the production of new wealth. That is the fundamental reason why our plight is so grave.

The United States, which has been supporting us and maintaining full employment for four years, has come to the conclusion that we are a nation worth investing in and assisting only when we have turned ourselves from insolvency to solvency. The fact that Britain is a debtor nation matters not at all. What matters is whether Britain is a debtor making good or a debtor going to the bad. We were debtors after the Napoleonic wars and we used that position to become the greatest trading nation in the world. The process can be renewed. No vast effort is required to transform the country from insolvency to solvency. Our overall world trade is already more or less in balance. A fractional increase in working hours upon the right type of exports would turn the overseas trade

balance into a surplus. When Britain finds a government of a traditional character and one that is respected in the world, we can immediately look for United States support for a resumption of convertibility immediately on current account and later, when the sterling balances have been funded, on capital account also. If that is accompanied by investments in this country and the Colonial Empire and by an import into the United States of sterling area raw materials the dollar gap will begin to melt away.

A return to traditionalism is clearly what the world is now forcing upon us, and with that return the Labour leaders who stand for arrogant and unnatural conceptions of collective planning will be overthrown. Those who survive will be those who are able to jettison in time the hubristic extensions of their policy and who cling fast to its original Christian purpose, the duty of the strong to aid the weak. On this there is complete common ground between the parties, as much Conservative legislation proves.

The problem is insoluble only so long as the present mathematicians are employed on it. Men fail in life when they do not see things in the round: the enemy always steals in through the blind spot in the eye. The blind spot in our Socialist Ministers is knowledge of the power and play of international commerce and the strengths and weaknesses of Britain's trading position. Mr Attlee's broadcast on the Government's economy programme revealed most clearly four years of exclusive and passionate attention paid to the social welfare of the workers in 'little England' and the gross neglect of our imperial and international commercial standing. The folly of having declared war by taxation and other devices of administration on those who knew how to maintain our vast population on rising standards is now manifest. Our standards are collapsing and no blame can be attributed to those bankers, traders, and administrators who might have prevented it. For they have been whipped and beaten into insensibility by the furious political hatred of the two worst Chancellors in British history.

LABOUR AND ITS REWARDS

Britain does not suffer only from controls on finance and raw material. We suffer also from a system of

4 THE COURSE OF CONSERVATIVE POLITICS

regulating wage rates which is too complex, rigid, and slow-acting. Sir Stafford Cripps's great wage freeze is no solution and will do us infinite harm. A search for new labour incentives is of vital consequence.

It seems we have to face a drastic change in the methods of wage bargaining. Nothing but economic chaos can result from the massive Trades Unionist methods we now have. We are a high-cost country and cannot possibly afford nation-wide increases. On the other hand it will be impossible to get people into the new jobs that our changing world trade position requires unless quick inducements are offered. There is only one solution which will allow the circumstances of our economic plight to be reconciled with justice for certain wage claims. Henceforward wage uplifts must be selective and local, based on factors that have been too much neglected, namely good attendance, good output, and good work. We must get back to the situation where in particular shipyard, machine shop, department store or farm wage and status differences prevail as between man and man on the same sort of task, based on a multitude of factors known only to the employer and the local Trades Union secretary, factors like character, ability, honesty, and faithful service. The time-honoured virtues must again be allowed to carry their pecuniary reward.

We need more cooperativism in industry and more purely local wage arrangements and less talk of the 'two sides of industry' and of 'national' wage bargaining. If it is right to speak of anti-monopoly against employers, it is right also to speak of anti-monopoly against over-centralised Trades Unionism. For that reason I do not look with alarm at reports of a break-up of Union discipline. I think it is old fashioned to want to put our industrial framework back where it was between the wars and to build up again the two gigantic sides of industry. The spirit of cooperation and team work between employers and men in industry grew rapidly in the war. That is the right road to success. Clearly the best and quickest way to get favourable rates for the wage-earner is by this method and not by returning to the overloaded Trade Union structure which, because of its endless delays due to the passing of documents and holding of committees, is keeping men months and months without satisfaction. The time has

come to discriminate and favour not by whole classes of workers but within classes right down to the individual. We must reward the able, the intelligent, and the courageous wherever they are found and penalise the thriftless and indigent. A Government which does these things will take Britain forward on her road to prosperity.

The incentives of Socialism are political power and mass subjection. We Conservatives believe in the individual, and we offer to restore to the individual the time-honoured spurs to success. The Socialist reward for success is to become a political commissar who lives in a three-roomed flat with a dictaphone and radio. The Socialist's discipline for the unfortunate is to be enslaved to the Essential Works Order or alternatively to be thrown out of industry with no chance of re-engagement in the man's trade. The Conservative reward for success is a large income and a large way of life, and our penalty for failure no worse than to lose one's savings and fall back on National Insurance and family charity at stable monetary values. There is no question but that the Conservative incentives operate in a free society within beneficent ranges while the Socialist incentives operate within a confined and restricted sphere the lower levels of which must be severely disciplined. The Conservative way undoubtedly offers a man, whether he is a success or whether he is a failure, far greater hope and a far higher meaning to his life.

* * * * *

ENGLAND'S 'SUCCESS-MISSION'

An American business man whom I met last year was speculating about the position and purpose of post-war England. He passed the usual comments on the nature of the Socialist Government, declared that our status as a world power was much diminished, held that we should be thankful for the massive American stand against Continental Communism, and then began an analysis of our situation and influence in the fields of diplomacy, education, sociology, technics, and the arts. After listening for a while I was conscious that this was turning into a favourable study of our contemporary position in its functional aspects and that it was leading him far away from his automatically adverse opinion on politics and economics.

I was therefore not surprised when he ended up : ' I sure don't know what you English are about but I guess you're on some sort of success-mission.'

Most people would agree that the figure of St George is shrouded in heavy mist at the present time and they are passionately anxious to know how soon he will emerge and in what guise. Of course there have been times before when his actions were inscrutable : in the time of Edward VI and Mary ; in 1806 when Wordsworth expressed his unhappiness ; in the 1820's ; and again thirty years ago when Kipling wrote : ' and now we and our kin, after these great years, are sick, dizzy and shaken, like all convalescents a little inclined to pity ourselves, a little inclined to stay as long as possible on invalid slops, and a little more than inclined to mistake the hysteria of convalescence for the symptoms of returning life and thought.'

But was not that American somehow expressing the secret of our traditional national character ? May it be not our historical success really is due to a sort of inscrutable purpose ; that, to reverse R. L. Stevenson, we arrive without having ever travelled hopefully ? May it be that victory has been handed to us in the past because, not knowing at any precise moment where we were going, the other man did not know either and just let us come along ? The success of Clive, Rhodes, and many others is explainable in these terms. A historian—I think Professor Hancock—calls us 'absent-minded builders of Empire.' May it be that our real genius is to have no plan ?

The English are very good at a war of defence, but unlike the Germans and French we are very bad, and have scarcely ever attempted, a war of aggression or exploitation. Probably it is because we have an inherent dislike of getting ourselves planned in time of peace ; and of course if you are going to launch a sudden onslaught you have to do that. In war Lord Montgomery would tell us that all must be exactly planned, the guns trained, the mines laid, the infantry practised and drawn up, great masses in reserve. The success of our planning in war has inspired some people like the British Ambassador in U.S.A. to extol the same arts for peace. His view to some extent inspired the authors of the Conservative Industrial Charter. But I believe the view to be wrong. I consider we are anti-

planners at heart. When the necessary war has been fought we ache to get back to that state of naturalness in which our finest peace-time victories have been won. There is no doubt in my mind that planning destroys our unique way of succeeding.

The malaise from which we suffer to-day is fundamentally due to the innate consciousness of the Englishman that his special aptitudes in peace are shackled to a system that has outlived its decade of usefulness. We are doing much, but if we could be released from the suzerainty of Whitehall we could do so much more and H.M. Treasuries would be all the richer. If Queen Elizabeth in the 1580's had controlled the details of Drake's journeys instead of contenting herself with his prayers and salutations her Empire and fortunes would have been the less. Our real genius is not a war-time but a peace-time affair and consists in refusing to plan and in an unconscious acquisition of power through the miscarried plans of others.

No one could possibly supply my American with an answer about our 'success-mission.' We may be out to conquer his own country, or Russia, or to cement Europe or build a new overseas Empire, we do not know, and if we did the news would put the other fellow on his guard. We must content ourselves with the thought that our mission, whatever it may be, will gain impetus as our Government gains wisdom and decides to unleash the extraordinary force that is in us.

ANGLO-AMERICAN PARTNERSHIP

There is, however, one facet of the English character which is of great importance to the Americans at the present time. It is our leavening, conciliatory, and colonising power. The English are by far the most successful administrators in the world. I am myself half American and spend a great deal of time praising the United States to my constituents, so have no fear in saying here that the Americans have not yet begun to understand the art of greatness overseas. Why should they? They only came out of their shell thirty years ago. England has been at the game since the Crusades. When the Englishman goes overseas—I do not mean to his continental playgrounds where incidentally he only misbehaves because he

is among the sort of people who know perfectly well how to deal with him—but when he settles overseas or goes on responsible missions what does he do? He takes a bit of England with him. He takes his home, his customs, and his traditions. He has the knack of breathing English air in his new surroundings and infecting those around him with the atmosphere of England, the peace of our countryside, the broad tolerance of our life and nature. Wherever an Englishman lays his head that is a bit of England for him. I know of course that this is very unpopular with the intellectuals and that skits are written for the music halls on the starched shirt in the jungle and similar procedures, and perhaps it is just as well to keep the thing from lapsing into absurdity. But mainly it prevails and the result is that despite wars or nationalistic movements which may set us back in particular areas our influence remains and is even now expanding.

With the American it is different. He has been projected overseas by the force of circumstance. He leaves his home behind. He is perpetually nostalgic and he uses all the resources of communication, physical and electrical, to keep himself in touch. He has not yet learnt the arts of settlement and abiding influence. I am sure they will come one day. For the present the advantage lies with the Englishman and, of course, the Scotsman too. The difference between us and the Americans is not so much a matter of superiority in education or *savoir-faire* or manners. These are veneers that a particular generation lays on. It is more a matter of heredity and historical fact. We were colonised so long ago that our blood is now a compound and no longer a mixture. It was more than 400 years ago that Henry VIII proclaimed 'This realm of England is an Empire.' That compound is tough enough to guide and influence the world. The American blood is still a mixture. They are still busy making a nation. They have not yet got to our stage.

But what a partnership there could be! Its beginnings are already manifest. There is the common language. German nationalism in the shape of Bismarck feared the common language before military might. In Germany, Italy, Greece, and the Middle East our friendship is thriving. The Americans provide the hustle, the resilience, and strength of their capitalist economy and we provide

diplomacy, interpretation, conciliation, wisdom, and poise. Great things may come of this.

I am convinced the future holds much success in store for us Englishmen. I do not believe those who say we are past our prime, that we are no longer to be numbered among the great powers, that we cannot maintain our civilisation, that we must disperse our people for the sake of starvation, atomic destruction or what you will. London is the oldest part of our imperial structure and small wonder if a little of the mould of decadence is to be found upon it. But have we in truth no power—no friends? Then let us observe the number of states who—churlishly unwarned—were yet prepared at a moment's notice to descend with us into the cellars of devaluation. On the contrary our assets are still priceless, and they lie in this generation of Englishmen, a people who exemplify the highest standards of health and education in the world, a people who through the fires of two great wars and much industrial unrest have learnt the art of human relations more completely than any other nation upon earth.

HINCHINGBROOKE.

Art. 2.—BRITAIN'S CONTRIBUTION TO HER OWN FOOD SUPPLY.

THE dominant theme of the British Association meeting at Newcastle-on-Tyne—initiated by its President Sir John Russell, F.R.S.—was 'World Population and World Food Supplies.' Emphasis was placed on the fact that the former, now estimated at 2,300,000,000, was increasing more rapidly than the world's food output, and this at a time when a higher standard of living (including nutrition) was being demanded by all democratic and socially progressive nations, whose peoples have concurrently come to realise that the semi-starvation of at least one-fourth of the world's inhabitants was conducive neither to world peace nor to their optimum health or productive efficiency. During the meeting rough calculations were made of the extent to which the main food producing countries could, making due allowance for their expanding populations, augment their food exports. As the President pointed out, the problem is complicated by the inequalities in the rate of world-population increase, the less advanced peoples multiplying more rapidly than the more advanced, and also by the unequal distribution of population over the earth's surface. It has come to be recognised that expansion of the world's food supplies depends—apart from the complicated problems of international commodity exchange and of transport to the deficiency regions—on a general extension of husbandry (beyond the 10 per cent. only of the world's land surface now growing food), the more intensive cultivation of the latter, and the reduction of the present serious and avoidable wastes and losses.

Where, it may be asked, does Great Britain stand in the world's food picture? To what extent can she feed herself? Except as regards pedigree live-stock she is not a supplier of farm products to other countries. Her dense population (about one-fiftieth of the whole human race) and relatively small and steadily shrinking agricultural and pastoral area necessitate the absorption of her output of essential foods, such as cereal corn, meat, milk, eggs, and potatoes, by her own consumers, leaving a large balance, under normal conditions, to be imported from abroad.

The experiences of war, coupled with the present dollar shortage and the devaluation of our currency, operate to

restrict these imports, with consequent increased austerity in food consumption and intensification of our own husbandry. The effect of the dollar shortage upon food imports may be roughly assessed by noting that, between 1934 and 1938, those coming from dollar sources were 16 per cent. as against 84 per cent. from non-dollar sources, whereas the relative percentages for 1947-48 were 25 per cent. and 75 per cent., and those for the current year (1949-50) are 12 per cent. (of which wheat accounts for 9 per cent.) and 88 per cent. The effect of the diversion of purchases of food from the dollar area can be illustrated by the fact that our dollar expenditure on food in 1946-47 was 90½ million dollars, in 1947-48 702 million, in 1948-49 555 million, and in the current financial year will be below 500 million. No small proportion of the dollar food purchases have been semi-luxury commodities such as dried fruits, canned salmon, and California and Florida citrus fruits, which the British farmer cannot supply. Our dependence upon North America for a considerable proportion of our modest cheese ration is a strong argument in favour of our building up cheese production in Great Britain, as and when sufficient milk (over and above our indispensable requirements of it in liquid form) becomes available for the purpose. We do not import cereal feeding-stuffs for our farm animals from dollar areas.

In two essential food commodities only has Great Britain been a self-supplier in normal pre-war years, viz. liquid milk and potatoes. The consumption of both of these has materially increased during and since the late war—the former in the interests of young children and the latter as a starchy substitute for wheat imports. Their home production, however, under Government direction, has increased *pari passu* with their consumption. Potato cultivation is not popular among farmers, owing to the labour involved in lifting the crop and the non-manufacture so far of any very effective labour-saving implement for the purpose.

The amount of pre-war, home-produced wheat and flour was 14 per cent. only of that consumed, but rose to 43 per cent. in 1944 and fell to 22 per cent. last year. Home-produced meat pre-war was 45 per cent. of that consumed, falling in 1944 to 31 per cent. and rising to 42 per cent. last year. Home-produced eggs were 59 per cent.

of those consumed, falling in 1944 to 37 per cent. and rising to 54 per cent. in 1948.

Taking foodstuffs generally, our consumption is on a lower level *per capita* than most comparable countries. Only in the case of the bulky foods—bread and potatoes—is it higher in the United Kingdom than in the U.S.A. Canada occupies an intermediate position. Our acute war-time shortage of food was of course due to our dependence upon imports prior to the war for more than half our supplies. Pre-war, over half our meat, nearly all the fats, and four-fifths of our cereal foods and our sugar were imported from abroad. Imported food, in fact, provided more than two-thirds of the calories and more than half of the total protein supply. Ten years ago, every day, from ten to fifteen food ships entered our ports, bringing in the course of a year 22,000,000 tons of human food and animal feeding-stuffs from abroad. On an average, 4,500,000 tons came from Argentina, 3,000,000 from Canada, 2,750,000 from Australia and New Zealand, 1,250,000 from India and Burma, 1,000,000 from the U.S.A., and about 4,000,000 from what during the war were enemy or enemy-occupied countries. During the war there were increases in our home production of 90 per cent. in the case of wheat and potatoes, 45 per cent. in that of vegetables, 19 per cent. in that of sugar-beet, and 25 per cent. in that of milk and milk products, while there were decreases of 15 per cent. in that of our butcher's meat, 50 per cent. in that of our pigmeat, 25 per cent. in that of our poultry, and 35 per cent. in that of our fruit. Among our external food supplies, our milk puddings were perhaps most materially affected, the entry of Japan into the war in December 1941 and her subsequent victories eliminating the normal sources of our sago and tapioca and (with the fall of Indo-China, Thailand, and Burma) reducing by 80 per cent. our supplies of rice. Research work between the two world wars revealed the fact that nearly half our population were not getting in the food that they consumed sufficient of the requisite nutrients in the form of calories, protein, vitamins, and minerals. During the war, Government food control, under scientific direction, enabled these deficiencies to be to a material extent rectified, and this rectification has continued since.

Roughly speaking, in Great Britain there was, for about

seventy years prior to the war, no very marked increase in the yield per acre of wheat, which stood at an average of from 30 to 32 bushels, rising during the last decade to 35 bushels. (The yields in Holland and Denmark are normally 33 per cent. above ours.) On the other hand, there has been a marked increase during the last twenty years in the yields of fodder crops, notably grass, and an appreciable increase in milk yield per cow from a deplorably low average datum level of less than 500 gallons during the annual lactation period. The average is now 564 gallons, as compared with 715 in Denmark.

Casting one's mind back over the last ten years one cannot but realise that there has been a veritable agricultural revolution in this country and one that is calculated to have permanent effects—mostly of a salutary character—upon the British countryside and upon its true economic function and justification. Its most striking feature is the great rise in the level of agricultural production. Our farming industry pre-war was in a state of chronic stagnation, suffering from half a century of depression and impoverishment (which drove out of it many of its most competent practitioners and their capital), broken only by a temporary, but restricted, First World War boom which, however, subsided in the early thirties. The conditions of the blockade in the Second World War compelled Great Britain, 'the sheet anchor' of whose husbandry had been for several generations her live-stock, to switch over in most areas to arable cultivation, as a means of providing as much food as possible for human consumption. During the six years of war, the area of her arable land was extended from 13 to more than 19 million acres, with a marked increase in wheat, potatoes, and vegetables. Concurrently more of the cattle cakes and other concentrated feeding-stuffs, previously imported, were replaced by home-grown supplies. This resulted in a 30 per cent. net increase in the volume of our agricultural output. The ploughing up of grassland materially affected live-stock husbandry, particularly as farmers were forbidden to feed to farm animals all crops humanly consumable, except oats, 'chat' potatoes, and tail corn. First priority was given to the needs of dairy cattle, which enabled their number to be increased by 300,000. The number of pigs, poultry, beef cattle, and sheep declined very considerably. At the

end of the war, Britain's lack of hard currency, coupled with shortage of food in Europe and Asia and war-time sales of oversea investments, disappointed the nation's hopes of a much improved diet and its farmers of an early return to normal live-stock farming. Economic necessities compelled the maintenance for a long period of an arable economy, a necessity accentuated by Britain's contribution to the food requirements of war-devastated areas on the European continent. In face of the world-wide food crisis of 1946, the milling extraction rate of our flour was again increased (it had been raised in 1942 to its maximum of 85 per cent.), bread rationing was introduced, and the rations of our live-stock fell below war-time levels. Since that time the position has somewhat improved, but the dollar crisis remains and is at present most acute. Britain is still concerned with seeking economic remedies from her own resources. This has meant that while some other countries, notwithstanding various setbacks, have largely returned to their pre-war economic pattern, including a reversion from arable crops to live-stock production, British farmers have been set the dual task of maintaining roughly the war-time tillage area and at the same time expanding substantially live-stock production. These two objects together comprise the 'Agricultural Expansion Programme' initiated in August 1947. This, if and when fulfilled, will secure by 1952 a supply of food from domestic sources which, in terms of calories (estimated at 3,000 per head per day), will be one-third above pre-war. At the same time, through increased home output of fodder crops and grass, it is hoped to save the equivalent of about four million tons of imported feeding-stuffs.

We are realising, at long last, that unripe leafy grasses are the most valuable of all animal foods. (When they develop their flower and their seed a large portion of their protein content is lost.) Our grass experts estimate that by proper management and control and rotational grazing the animal food output of our pastures could be raised by from 50 to 100 per cent., with a corresponding increase in their yield of meat and milk. This is particularly important at a time when, owing to the reduced imports of cereals from the American Continent for currency reasons, their continued abnormal production at home is unavoidable, with consequent maintenance of our arable area.

According to the Government plan within the next three years our permanent grassland will have been reduced by one-quarter compared with its pre-war area and our tillage land will have been extended by 60 per cent.

One notable result of modern research, conducted mainly in New Zealand, is what is called 'the soil fertility cycle'—the discovery that by feeding phosphates to the clovers in a mixed pasture, nitrogen from the air is supplied in larger measure by the nitrogen-fixing nodules on their roots, with a fertilising effect upon the grasses equivalent in value to the application of several hundredweights of sulphate of ammonia per acre.

War-time experience has lent emphasis to the value of silage and (to those who can afford the somewhat expensive equipment) the artificial drying of grass. Special stress is laid on ley farming (putting cultivated land for two or more years under temporary herbage) as a means of maintaining its fertility and improving the yield of grass for stock feeding.

Total agricultural net output under the Government plan is intended to be 50 per cent. above that reached at the outbreak of war. As for the foodstuffs which cannot be produced at home, Britain is at present looking to increased supplies from the sterling area and the countries comprised in the Organisation for European Economic Cooperation and their oversea territories. At the end of the Marshall Plan period the total supply of food to the population of the United Kingdom is considered likely to approach the pre-war volume, although in its composition and balance the diet will not be fully restored to its pre-war level.

Under the Expansion Programme there is expected to be, by 1952, an increased agricultural output of the value of 100,000,000*l.* Half of it is to be secured from additions to the resources of the farming industry and the other half from increased efficiency. Approximately half of the increase in output is envisaged from live-stock based on grass or imported feeding-stuffs and the other half from arable husbandry. Much of the large capital outlay required nowadays for successful farming is represented by modern machinery, such as heavy tractors, combine harvesters, and grass driers, which increase farming output and improve productivity. The number of tractors alone has risen from 50,000 before the war to 250,000 to-day, and

further increases are expected. It cannot be gainsaid that the food output of Britain could be greatly augmented, even beyond the scope of the Government plan, if on the one hand we utilised for the purpose a larger area of our so-called 'marginal' land, much of which, formerly grazed by live-stock, is to-day smothered with scrub and bracken, and if, on the other hand, mechanisation, already extended greatly during the last decade, were far more fully employed than it is at present. Of the 65,000,000 cultivable acres in the British Isles no less than 22,000,000 are classed as 'Rough Grazing.' At least one-half of the latter could now, with the aid of mechanisation and suitable fertilisation, be profitably cultivated and contribute materially to the national larder.

It is noteworthy and suggestive that, in spite of immense advances in scientific discovery and technique during the last three quarters of a century, we have not materially increased our food production since 1875, although in the interval our population has nearly doubled. At present we produce annually about 750,000,000*l.* worth of food, while we import over 850,000,000*l.* worth.

Twenty-three years ago while on an agricultural tour in North America I had an illuminating interview with Mr Henry Ford, the great American motor manufacturer, at his home at Dearborn, Michigan, U.S.A. On approaching his house I noticed no less than six tractors, with attached ploughs, ploughing simultaneously a nearby field of about twenty-five acres. I suggested to him that this seemed a wholly uneconomic proceeding. His reply was that, in view of the unsettled weather, and the rapidity of cultivation thus effected, it was a thoroughly paying proposition. I was not then wholly convinced. Our experience in England during the last few years has demonstrated the rightness of his reasoning, especially in a country like ours with a fickle climate. One of our own most eminent tractor engineers has lately been preaching the gospel of far greater mechanisation—even on the smallest holdings—as calculated to increase immeasurably our home food output and, by the almost entire supersession of horse labour and a great relative reduction in man-power per 100 acres, to reduce the cost of its production by at least 40 per cent. He may be right. Time alone will show. Although the use of all this labour-saving plant and machinery will to

some extent reduce the rising demand for farm personnel, some additional farm workers will no doubt have to be found and greater technical skill will be expected of them. This in turn will require some considerable improvement in the number and quality of farm workers' cottages during the next few years. The prolonged depression of our agricultural industry in the past has proved a serious obstacle to the provision of decent homes for our country workers.

During the current financial year 1,500,000*l.* of public money is being spent on Farm Institutes, Agricultural Research Stations, Agricultural and Veterinary Colleges, and Experimental Farms. Apart from capital investment there is a steadily increasing demand every year for various farm requisites, such as fertilisers and feeding-stuffs, a large proportion of which are supplied from domestic sources. To take only one example, the consumption of fertilisers is at present two and a half to three times as high as it was before the war, and this (especially in the case of phosphates) seems likely to increase considerably in the future.

Although the expansion programme had to be designed in the first instance to meet the requirements of a temporary emergency, there is no reason why it should not be maintained and indeed improved upon. Whether it can be maintained without undue cost to the taxpayer or consumer will depend upon the efficiency of the producer. Efficiency in turn has two aspects, first the encouragement of better methods, and secondly the penalisation of bad ones. As to the latter, the Agriculture Act of 1947, which in its first part offers farmers, as a permanent policy, guaranteed prices and assured markets, in its second, or regulatory part, enacts control measures necessary to ensure reasonable standards of good farm and estate management, with the ultimate sanction of dispossession. In regard to the improvement of methods, main reliance is placed on the provision of technical advice to farmers and land-owners and the general oversight of their activities, by the County Agricultural Executive Committees. While the overall policy for agriculture is devised by Government Departments, its execution is left largely to these Committees, which are modelled on their successful predecessors—the County War Agricultural Executive Committees. Closely interwoven with their work is that

of the National Agricultural Advisory Service, which was set up in 1946 and whose function it is to provide technical advice and instruction, free of charge, to all those engaged in agriculture and horticulture. The County Staffs of the N.A.A.S. have been integrated with those of the C.A.E.Cs., and as the County Advisory Officer is also the Executive Officer of the County Committee, close coordination of effort is secured. In addition, the N.A.A.S. includes scientific staff, in the main grouped provincially, whose function is, in conjunction with the work of Agricultural Research Institutes, to bring the more economically valuable results of scientific work to the farming community with the least possible delay, and explained in language intelligible to the man on the land. Acting in concert with the N.A.A.S. is an Agricultural Land Service concerned with maintaining and improving the standards of farm and estate management. If public sympathy and confidence are to be assured during the next few critical years, maximum food output from Britain's farm lands must be obtained at minimum cost.

In aiming at greater self-containedness starchy food, such as white bread and potatoes, should present in future no serious difficulty, save in years of exceptionally bad harvest weather, especially in view of the present availability of high quality wheats suitable for spring, as well as autumn, sowing and the rapidity of mechanised harvesting. Our main shortages in self-supply are likely to be protein foods and (more permanently) vegetable oils and fats. The latter require for their optimum production more continuous sunshine than is normally experienced in this and other temperate countries. The world will depend preponderantly for these on tropical and subtropical regions such as Tanganyika Territory, with its groundnuts, and other parts of Africa, Australia, and Argentina with their maize, palm-nut kernels, sunflowers, and cotton-seed. Sunflowers are however an exception to the above general rule as to the unsuitability of vegetable fat production in temperate countries. They have an exceptionally high oil content and experience is proving that they can be quite successfully grown as a source of edible oil in parts of England and South Wales, and with an oil content at least as high as that obtainable from this crop in any other part of the world.

As regards both animal protein and animal fat the pig deserves more attention than he has hitherto received. In the light of my experience at the Ministry of Food in the First World War I suggested, in a paper which I read before the British Association at its meeting in Edinburgh twenty-eight years ago, that the most secure basis for Britain's food supply in war-time was to be sought in a largely increased production of pigs, potatoes, and milk, the justification for the first two being the rapid reproduction of protein and animal fat in the case of pigs and of starchy food in that of potatoes. But during the Second World War, while potatoes and milk were encouraged, a discount was placed upon pigs, as also upon poultry, as being severe competitors with human beings as regards their food. The food ration of pigs and poultry was cut progressively from one-third to one-eighth of their pre-war customary allowance, with the result that there was a decrease of the former by 60 per cent. and the latter by 40 per cent. To-day we are being urged to grow more wheat owing to the dollar shortage (and its justification cannot reasonably be challenged), but if our rations are to be properly balanced for optimum efficiency, the crying need for the next few years is likely to be protein and fat, which pigs can so well and so rapidly furnish. Recent 'Goodwill Missions' for the Royal Agricultural Society of England to subtropical parts of the British Commonwealth have evoked my strong advocacy of a large increase in such areas in the production of pigs (the only farm animal which does not suffer from any serious tropical disease), especially as ideal pig foods can be grown in these regions. I rejoice to learn of the scheme for raising in Central Queensland (with a view to an increase in Britain's bacon ration) several million bushels of grain sorghum (commencing with $1\frac{1}{2}$ million in 1949, feeding it *in loco* to 1,000 sows and their progeny) and incidentally despatching to this country an initial cargo of 20,000 tons of such grain to augment the scanty supply of Britain's pig foods. This alone should represent an immediate addition of 3,000 tons of particularly suitable food for Britain's own pigs, with a prospect of far larger supplies in future years.

No picture of Britain's future supplies of home-raised food would be complete without some reference to fruit. This, although not an indispensable food, is, from its vitamin content (especially vitamin C) so conducive to

good health and so useful an antidote to dietetic monotony as to render desirable its maximum home production, especially as an appreciable quantity has come in the past from dollar countries. Dessert apples and black currants are worthy of special mention. Our climate is quite favourable to the largely increased production of both. Our apple orchards have extended considerably, in recent years, most of them being planted (or replanted) with familiar and choice table varieties, such as Cox's Orange Pippin, Worcester Pearmain, Laxton's Superb, Lord Lambourne, or James Grieve, many of which are grafted on certain types of rootstock (resulting from research at East Malling Research Station in Kent) which will ensure earlier maturity and a far heavier yield of fruit. The only culinary apple that is now largely grown is Bramley's Seedling, admitted all over the world to be the best 'apple dumpling' apple. Fertilisation, winter and summer pruning, winter and spring spraying, and more careful grading and packing have become the practice of most commercial growers, with substantial financial advantage to themselves. The processing of apple juice, mainly for Infant Welfare establishments and for refreshing summer beverages, has spread considerably, and much of it has been 'fortified' by citrus juice (imported from subtropical countries) in order to strengthen its vitamin C content. The discovery, as the result of research at the Cawthron Research Institute in New Zealand, that Sturmer Pippin (both fresh and stored) contains more vitamin C than any other known variety of apple seems likely to popularise its growth at home and stimulate a commercial demand for it, with less need for blending apple juice with that of another fruit imported from abroad. Black currants are (apart from rose hips) the chief source of vitamin C preparations which are so strongly advocated for young children and invalids, and their production has spread appreciably during the last decade, and is still spreading all over England and Wales, and if properly grown, sprayed, drastically pruned, and generously manured, are a profitable crop. Vitamin C factories have of late been erected for their expert processing, in order to cope with the large demand for the preparations made from them.

One hopeful factor in augmenting the supply of our home-grown food is the conduct of a more vigorous and

better organised attack upon preventable animal and plant diseases and pests. A potential gain of at least 25 per cent. in each direction may be looked for. Our English Department of Agriculture was established exactly sixty years ago, with the object of combating such contagious animal diseases as pleuropneumonia, cattle plague, and foot and mouth disease. The first two have long ago been wiped out, but there are occasional outbreaks of foot and mouth disease, which, with tuberculosis, mastitis, and contagious abortion, reduce materially our output of milk and meat. Forty per cent. of our bovines are said to react to the tuberculin test, although probably less than half a per cent. yield tuberculous milk. If all reacting animals were slaughtered, as in the U.S.A. and Denmark, there would be a milk famine. Pasteurisation of our urban milk supply is sought as a palliative. It is estimated that 25 per cent. of Britain's dairy cattle suffer from mastitis and over 30 per cent. from contagious abortion, and that the annual loss of milk from these three diseases (including tuberculosis) is about 200 million gallons. The estimated annual monetary loss from preventable bovine diseases is put at 28,000,000*l.* This is largely due to our deficient veterinary service, as shown by the Loveday Report published in 1945. The only other civilised country which has less than 100 veterinary surgeons per million of the larger domesticated animals is France, and she is the only one of the Western European Countries which has an average milk yield per cow lower than ours. A 10 per cent. increase in the number of *experienced* veterinarians, exercising proper control, might well result indirectly in a 12 per cent. increase in the nation's home-raised protein food within the next five years.

Among our most notable food plant pests to-day, apart from rodents, are potato eelworm, potato blight, 'virus yellows' in sugar beet, wireworm and 'take-all' (*Ophiobolus Graminis*), and eye-spot in wheat, the three latter owing their prevalence to the ploughing up of old pasture and over-cropping with white straw crops during the war.

To sum up, what, it may be asked, are the future food-producing potentialities of Great Britain? (I carefully do not say 'probabilities,' as these are naturally limited in a great industrial country like this by questions of inter-

national commodity exchange and other factors governing national economic policy.)

With a vastly expanding mechanisation of Britain's husbandry (enabling both economy of labour and rapidity in the execution of farm operations during intervals of fine weather), the greater application of Science to the tasks of the husbandman, particularly in regard to the improvement and utilisation of his grasslands, a considerable expansion of an efficient veterinary service, the extension of artificial insemination of live-stock, the better education of the young farmer, the economic stimulus afforded by Government-guaranteed prices for the chief food products, the gradual but courageous elimination of grossly inefficient food producers, the National Agricultural Advisory Service (when fully developed), and the gradual suppression of animal and plant diseases and pests, an average increase of at least 20 per cent. in the present output of home-raised food (even allowing for the steady shrinkage of our agricultural area) is a by no means excessive target at which to aim, and its achievement would materially add to the nation's security and physical well-being.

In estimating Britain's future food requirements, account must of course be taken of the higher average standard of nutrition (so essential to national efficiency, health, and happiness) at which all parties in the State have aimed for many years and in which we who belong to the British Commonwealth seek to set an example to the world.

In face of many handicaps Britain can legitimately claim to be making a substantial contribution to the food requirements of the world. There are not many countries which have increased net agricultural output by 30 per cent. since pre-war days and are realistically contemplating a further increase to 50 per cent. above that level within the next five years. But she can do better still in the days that lie before us, if full and continuing confidence and a reasonable measure of security are afforded by her Government (whatever be its political complexion) to all her most efficient and progressive agricultural practitioners. Only thus can she hope to make the most profitable contribution to the solution of one of the most burning problems of our time—the feeding of the people of the world at such a standard as to secure their optimum health and vocational efficiency.

BLEDISLOE.

Art. 3.—COUNTING BRITAIN'S BIRDS.

RECENT years have seen the development of bird-watching from the status of a hobby to a science of considerable importance, and it is now generally realised that the abundance or otherwise of birds in a district and, more especially, the distribution of the members of the various species are economic factors which play their part in agriculture, horticulture, and a host of other things.

It is, indeed, becoming universally recognised that instead of regarding such things as bird protection and vermin extinction on a broad national basis, much more localised observation is necessary. An abundance, rather than the mere presence, of such species as the rook, the starling, and even the much maligned little owl is the only foundation on which to make a true assessment of its relationship to crop-growing activities.

Not so very long ago British naturalists were reminded that while they had spent a deal of time in obtaining masses of interesting information about such rare species as the harriers, eagles and the like, there had been far too few really scientific observations on the habits and life histories of many of the more common birds. That plea for more information about the ordinary birds of both town and countryside was successful, with the result that in recent years the British Trust for Ornithology, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, the British Empire Naturalists' Association, and a host of local natural history societies operating in a limited area have organised bird surveys and censuses with the intention of finding more about the habits and distribution of such common species as the heron, the great crested grebe, the magpie, and the different members of the owl family.

Within the last two decades there have been several attempts to estimate the total land-bird breeding population of Britain. In May 1932, Mr E. M. Nicholson gave the figure for England and Wales as about 80 million; in his 'Watching Birds,' published in November 1940, Mr James Fisher put the figure for Great Britain (excluding Ireland) as 120,259,700. This works out at an average of two birds per acre. Mr Fisher went on to say:

'Though there are 424 species in the British list, only about 100 of them contribute anything significant to this total and the

great bulk of it (about 75 per cent.) is made up by thirty species, all of which have a population of 350,000 or over in England and Wales. The commonest birds in England and Wales are the chaffinch and blackbird, of which there are about 10 millions each. There are about 7 million starlings, and the same robins. House-sparrows, hedge-sparrows, song thrushes, and meadow pipits number about 3 millions each, rooks $1\frac{1}{2}$ millions. At about $1\frac{1}{4}$ millions we find yellowhammers, wrens, white-throats, willow warblers, and wood-pigeons; at three-quarters of a million jackdaws, skylarks, blue tits, swallows, house martins, and linnets; at 350,000 greenfinches, great tits, tree-pipits, mallards, chiffchaffs, moorhens, swifts, lapwings, and partridges. It should be stressed that these are very approximate figures.'

There are, indeed, many contributory causes for increases and decreases in bird population. It must be remembered that bird life is competitive and when we have several species in an area feeding upon the same kind of food there comes a time when continued increases will result in saturation point being reached. Man's activities, too, bring about changes in environment and cause fluctuations in bird populations. Extensive tree felling can, of course, bring about great changes in the distribution of breeding rooks, the cutting down of hedges during the development of building estates causes hedge-nesting birds to seek other areas, and the re-ploughing of former arable land has an effect on the distribution of those species that breed on the ground. And as the disturbed populations are forced to look elsewhere for sites, so does the tendency for saturation in other areas increase.

In addition, we have losses and gains brought about through biological causes, but Nature has her own way of balancing these. In his 'Background to Birds,' Mr Brian Vesey-Fitzgerald has pointed out that it is possible, generally speaking, to work out the losses suffered by any species by the number of young reared, and cites the case of the blackbird, a pair of which, on the average, will lay nine eggs a year. About half will be hatched and reared which means that the end of the breeding season should see an increase of something like 200 per cent. in the number of blackbirds.

Such an increase, he points out, would soon mean overpopulation so far as this species is concerned, and goes on to say :

'If the numbers are to remain steady (and taken over a period of years they do remain remarkably steady) it means that out of every six blackbirds in August only two must survive at the beginning of the next breeding season. Six in August is, of course, an over-estimate, for one at least of the four would fail to reach maturity. Of the others one will probably fall a victim to a hawk or a cat, and another will not survive the winter for one reason or another. That leaves one over, and that is a necessary reserve, at least until the breeding season, to make up for accidents.'

After dealing with the normal clutches of other species, Mr Vesey-Fitzgerald informs us that :

'It is important to realise that if you know the number of birds born each year you also know the number that die. They must be the same so long as the species is not becoming more rare or more common.'

In recent years, however, another factor has had to be taken into consideration as affecting the balance of bird distribution. During the early part of 1947 thousands of birds perished during the prolonged spell of frost and snow, lapwings and other ground-feeding species suffering great reductions. Even the end of the snow did not bring immediate relief, for the cold weather continued and the trees were later than usual in bearing foliage. As a consequence, many birds postponed nesting until trees, hedges, and undergrowth were able to afford sufficient protective covering. This meant a considerable reduction in the number of early broods, and even when the early broods were successfully hatched out a lack of insect food caused many fledglings to perish.

One of the chief sufferers was a bird which has engaged the attention of the bird counters within the last decade, the heron. In 1928 the British Trust for Ornithology organised a census of the heronries in Great Britain, and since then annual counts of the nesting grounds have been made in order that the fluctuations of the heron population of these islands can be duly recorded.

Hard winters of 1939-40 and 1944-45 caused considerable reductions in the numbers of breeding herons, but a surprising feature revealed by the annual counts was a quick return to par in the next two or three years and then a position of comparative stability until the next cold winter came along.

The 1947 count revealed that there had been a decrease of some 35 per cent. on the figures since the previous year, and a 44 per cent. decrease since the first census was made in 1928. In 1948, however, there was a slight increase on the 1947 figures and at the time of writing I have recorded a substantial increase for 1949 among the heronries of the north-west of England.

The advantage of studying heron populations is fairly obvious. Herons, like rooks, build their nests high in the trees and, again like rooks, they nest in colonies. Once occupied, many of the sites continue for many years and, although tree-felling and other factors sometimes cause local changes, it is usually comparatively easy to check up the birds' movements. That means that the yearly total of nests can be arrived at with a greater degree of certainty than in the case of hedge or field nesting birds.

As an example of the way in which herons cling to established sites, I should mention the heronry at Chilham, in Kent, which is referred to in records of the year 1293 and since then its continuity has never been interrupted. At the beginning of the present century, over a hundred nests were regularly to be seen there, but to-day there are only about half that number.

At Aldershaw, in Sussex, herons have bred since the time of Edward I, but here the actual site has shifted several times, although it is quite likely that the modern colony is the lineal descendant of the ancient one. Near Peebles, in Scotland, there is a heronry at Dawyck mentioned in a record for May 1497, and that at Allers Wood, in Somerset, can be traced back to 1545.

Even the building of a substantial village in the near vicinity of Holmesear Wood, near Rossington, on the South Yorkshire coalfield has not succeeded in causing the birds to desert a clump of trees that have been used for nesting since time immemorial. Fifty years ago a pit was sunk near by and houses built within fifty yards of the trees, but the birds continue to breed there.

Not always, however, do herons succeed in adapting themselves to changing conditions, and the fluctuations of a group of heronries on the edges of the Forest of Bowland, that wild moorland area on the borders of Lancashire and Yorkshire, are interesting. Records of the middle of last century speak of a large heronry in the grounds of Brows-

holme Hall, near Clitheroe, the hereditary home of the Parkers, or Foresters, of Bowland, but about the year 1890 the birds deserted and founded a new colony in the park-lands adjoining Harrop Hall, at Slaidburn. They did not remain there very long, however, and early in the present century another change was made, this time to Gisburn Park, in the Ribble Valley, where some birds have nested ever since.

Eighteenth-century records speak of a large heronry in a wood at the Holmestone, on Dungeness, but over a hundred years ago the woodland in which the birds built their nests was razed by preventive men in order to deprive the local smugglers of a favourite shelter for concealing their contraband cargoes. A further attempt on the part of the herons to re-establish themselves in the district in 1908 was not successful.

Birds which breed in colonies are always easy to count, and so in 1938 a census count of breeding black-headed gulls was undertaken and it was estimated that there were something like 150,000 in England and Wales. Although the majority of books list this gull as a sea-bird, there has been a great change of habit and to-day it is just as often seen inland as on the coasts. Many of the gulleries are situated twenty or more miles away from the nearest shore.

The black-headed gull is, undoubtedly, the most common gull south of the Scottish Border and can be distinguished from other members of the family by its smaller size, its somewhat airy method of flight, and the chocolate, not black, coloured hood which is a breeding adornment only and disappears to leave only a few blotches round the head.

During its flights between the inland breeding grounds and the coast, this gull found it possible to eke out as good a living among the fields as on the shores, with the result that to-day the black-headed gull is as common inland as on the coast and the old country belief that the sight of sea gulls among the fields and on the outskirts of the town is a portender of stormy weather has very few supporters. Hundreds of the birds can, at all times of the year, be seen in suitable country, feeding on grubs, worms, leather-jackets, and other larvæ in company with the lapwings and rooks.

In 1884 J. E. Harting came to the conclusion that the

black-headed gull was rapidly decreasing as a breeding bird in these islands, but twenty years later there was no doubt that it was beginning to re-establish itself and new colonies were being formed. Records of 1913 show that there were ninety colonies in England and Wales, but it must be remembered that nothing in the way of a special survey was organised that year and that figure is therefore likely to be on the small side. A map of colonies at that time shows them to be most thickly distributed about the Solway and in Northumberland, down the Pennine of mid-Yorkshire, on the moors of Merioneth, Montgomery and Radnor, in North Lincolnshire, and on the Suffolk coast. There was also a little cluster in East Dorset.

When the British Trust for Ornithology organised a thorough census in 1938, the number of occupied colonies had increased to 158, and the map shows a distinct thickening around the Solway and in Northumberland, and a southerly spread down the line of the Pennine. The North Lincolnshire, Suffolk, and Dorset colonies had remained fairly constant, but there had been a great increase in Wales, both inland and along the coastal areas bordering Cardigan Bay.

Some naturalists have suggested that the wholesale disturbance of colonies during the First World War, when gathering gulls' eggs was encouraged, was an important factor in causing the birds to disperse over a wider area, but it would seem that this spread was already under way at the start of the First World War. As Mr P. A. D. Hollom wrote in the British Trust for Ornithology Report on the 1938 census :

'It appears that the present distribution was already sketched in broad outline twenty-five years ago, and that little completely new ground has been broken except in the middle of England. What has occurred has chiefly been consolidation within and expansion in the neighbourhood of areas already occupied. It is significant that though some gulleries have been deserted, practically no districts have been deserted by breeding birds.'

Despite the fact that inland gulleries have continued to increase during the past ten years, the largest still remains at a coastal site, and a stretch of sand-hills on the Cumberland coasts at Drigg Point, opposite the Roman-old port of Ravenglass, has something like 50,000 breeding pairs,

or two-thirds of the total population of England and Wales, every year.

It is, of course, inconceivable that the black-headed gull colonies should have the same permanence as the heronries for there are many more factors contributing to desertion, especially at the inland sites. Draining of the bogs in the interests of sheep-rearing has an adverse effect and has caused the desertion of many former moorland gulleries in the Pennine country, while crows also succeed in getting a plentiful haul of eggs. The gull is a persistent nester, but continued destruction of its eggs eventually drives it away from a site. As a result, Britain's inland gulleries are constantly changing. I remember great colonies on the Saddleworth Moors, on the borders of Yorkshire and Lancashire, being deserted some twelve years ago and the birds have never returned.

Another bird whose breeding population is fairly accurately known as the result of a constant check maintained by ornithologists is the great crested grebe, which usually nests on waters of over five acres in extent and on most of the larger lakes and reservoirs.

This one of our most handsome birds—indeed, it could even be said that had it been less handsome it would have been more plentiful—especially in the spring when it puts on its conspicuous blackish-brown ear tufts which rise almost to a point above a head crowned with the same colour. Not content with this embellishment, there are reddish-black frills to the white cheeks, while the rest of the plumage is greyish-brown in the upper parts and white underneath. During the winter months the plumage is not so bright and the ear-tufts diminish in length considerably.

Time was when the great crested grebe was much more common in this country than is the case to-day, but in the middle of the last century came the interference from man that soon brought about a rapid decline. In their report on 'The Great Crested Grebe Enquiry, 1931,' Messrs. T. H. Harrison and P. A. D. Hollom stated :

'For a great many years there had been a regular traffic on the continent, and grebe feathers, particularly the breast feathers as "grebe furs," were fashionable in Britain. But not until 1857 did anyone realise that the market could, to some extent at least, be supplied from home. . . . Along with this

came the increase in collecting, the mid-Victorian epoch of plumes and stuffed kingfishers, the increased value of eggs as the species became more scarce. All this combined nearly wiped out the grebe.'

The passing of the Wild Birds' Protection Acts of 1877 and 1880 did much to assist a partial recovery, but the numbers have never approached the vicinity of those before the slaughter. In 1931 the British Trust for Ornithology made the first real census of great crested grebes in the country, and it was estimated that between 1155 and 1162 pairs were occupying 490 sites in England and Wales. The census was repeated in 1946 and 1947, the last count following the winter of 1946-47 when it was reported that there had been an all-round decrease of between 15 and 20 per cent. throughout the country. Now, as in the case of the heron, future census counts will show the rate of recovery.

Another bird which has been receiving a great deal of attention in recent years has been the rook, and as part of a special investigation undertaken by members of the British Trust for Ornithology for the Agricultural Research Council a large-scale count of rooks' nests took place in the years 1944 to 1946. The object of this investigation was not only to find out if there was a significant increase in the rook population of these islands, but also whether the rooks' feeding habits were changing. In other words, it was a large-scale inquiry with the express purpose of discovering any relationship between increased population and feeding habits.

A previous census had been carried out in England in the 1930's and a comparison of the figures showed an apparent increase of some 27 per cent., but in Wales the rather scanty figures indicated the possibility of a decrease. In Scotland, however, where there are districts with a great concentration of rooks and the rookeries attain large sizes, there had been an increase. It was estimated that the total population for Great Britain was slightly under the three million mark, a figure which might be compared with Mr E. M. Nicholson's estimated 750,000 to one million *breeding pairs* in 1932 and Mr Fisher's $1\frac{1}{2}$ millions in 1940.

The crops of 1,577 rooks from different parts of the country were examined in order that their food content could be ascertained, and it was discovered that although

it appeared that the rooks were eating a higher proportion of grain than in previous years, this was more likely a result of the increase in population rather than indicative of a substantial change in feeding habits. The whole question was summed up in the report of the Agricultural Research Council to the Ministry of Agriculture :

' The general conclusion in the light of this latest investigation is that there is no definite scientific justification either for *national* measures aimed at reducing appreciably the rook population, or for encouraging its increase. There may be a case for local control where the birds are in large numbers and their feeding is concentrated on a small number of corn fields, as for instance near large rookeries.'

Here, then, we have a practical example of the relationship between bird populations and feeding habits and of how the taking of periodic bird counts enables problems to be dealt with from a local rather than a national point of view.

The four species mentioned are perhaps the only examples of the more common land birds whose breeding members have been assessed with any degree of certainty, the black-headed gull being considered a land-breeding bird because of its preference for inland and estuarine sites rather than cliffs and rocky islands. In the case of birds whose population is but sparse or confined to one area it has been easy to keep reliable records of increases and decreases, and the stimulus given by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, in making cash payments in connection with certain species when young are certified as successfully leaving the nest, has assisted many of the rarities to maintain a hold in these islands.

It is extremely improbable that more than 250 pairs of golden eagles still breed in these islands and the majority of these have their eyries north of the Caledonian Canal. However, during the breeding seasons of 1947 and 1948 over twenty payments were made by the Royal Society for British Birds, and as the Society's scheme applies chiefly to haunts south of the Great Glen and in the islands it seems as though the most majestic of British birds may not only hold its own but be given an opportunity of increasing.

Great as has been the persecution of the golden eagle ever since the collapse of Jacobite resistance and the depopulation of the glens in the interests of grouse and deer

rearing, another British bird of prey, the kite, has suffered even more, and to-day the breeding population in these islands is confined to less than a dozen pairs in a restricted area of Wales.

Once, however, the kite was one of the commonest of British birds, in town and country alike. Mr R. S. R. Fitter, in 'London's Natural History,' tells us :

'Throughout the sixteenth century kites seem to have swarmed in London, and being protected as scavengers became so fearless that they would come down and take their carrion even in crowds. Charles Clusius, the great Flemish botanist, who visited England in 1571, thought there were as many kites in London as in Cairo, and described how they picked up and ate the garbage thrown into the streets and even into the Thames.'

and a search through the registers of many a parish shows that the kite, or glead, was sufficiently prolific to be slaughtered in the interests of poultry rearing and that 'head money' was paid by the churchwardens.

So the persecution began and was extended. Mr Fitter has written of their disappearance from London, saying that :

'By the eighteenth century they had become rare, having apparently lost their protected status, but in 1734 some still nested in the trees round St Giles-in-the-Fields, together with rooks and magpies, while Pennant in a letter written in August 1777 mentions some young kites taken from a nest in Gray's Inn, with frogs in their stomachs. The final disappearance of the kite from London was not chronicled ; from the fact that Pennant also refers to the kite having nested in Hyde Park on two occasions as something rather unusual, it seems probable that kites ceased to breed in London before the end of the century. The story of the kite in London concludes with one flying over Piccadilly on June 24, 1859.'

In the first half of the nineteenth century, county after county was cleared of the birds, and the last English record of successful nesting is one for 1870 when someone took the eggs from a nest in Bullington Wood, near Wragby, in Lincolnshire. Nine years later, a gunman, E. T. Booth, visited the last Scottish breeding haunt at Rothiemurchus, in Speyside. Mr Fisher, who is perhaps the greatest authority on the bird to-day, has told us the rest :

'Booth had hidden by a kite's nest in order to shoot the male—he already had a female, some eggs, and some young in his collection. He describes his wait at a nest, to get a male: "I could plainly see his shadow thrown in through the upper branches of the trees before he came in view; and as there was an open space round the nest, he afforded the easiest possible shot, and fell as dead as a stone at my feet." The female, who was at that time at a great height, immediately sailed away to the north without turning round to see what had happened to her mate or young. Booth took the young one, fed it until it reached the size he wanted, and then killed it for a specimen. He then wrote: "Since the above was written I have again been through the various districts inhabited by kites. In most of the glens the birds were still present; but a pair or two appeared to be wanting. Having no occasion for procuring specimens, I never molested them in the slightest degree." Booth must have known perfectly well that he had done the kite in; there may have been a pair left in that year, 1879; there is no evidence of any since, ever.'

The bird, however, continued to find a sanctuary in a Welsh valley. At the beginning of the present century some three pairs was about the average and then from 1912 to 1920 there were ten breeding pairs. After that there came a decline but in the early 1930's there were a couple of dozen birds about, although never more than eight pairs bred. In 1917 Miss Dorothy Raikes took over the Kite Preservation Fund, under which bounties of 20*l.* are given to tenants of land upon which a pair of kites rears at least one youngster, and since then the number of breeding pairs has varied between three and seven. Twice pairs have endeavoured to extend the breeding range, in Devon in 1913 and Cornwall in 1920, but without success.

There is not the slightest doubt that the future of the kite is in grave jeopardy, and many believe that the bird is doomed as a British breeding species. Some of the birds still remaining in Wales are beyond breeding age, and Mr Fisher has also told us that:

'Kite Valley proper, with its three or four pairs, has got as many as it can hold and it is contrary to the rules or nature to insist on, or hope for, its holding any more. If the kite is to recover its numbers, it must spread back to other areas from which it long ago departed.'

Unfortunately, any youngsters which seek new quarters still have to run the gauntlet of the collector and, of course,

the type of farmer and gamekeeper who still believes that any bird with a hooked bill and powerful talons is an enemy. There is not the slightest reason for shutting our eyes to the fact that kites are still being shot, and until there is a more general understanding of the habits of many of our birds of prey, the kite will, I fear, continue to suffer a fate it so ill deserves. Officials of the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds have expressed the view that, given every chance, the bird could extend its breeding range and while it would never again be as common as in the sixteenth century it should be possible for all bird lovers to see it. Until such times, however, access to the sanctuary in Wales must be jealously guarded.

Another bird whose numbers are now being watched with interest is the bearded tit. At one time this fascinating little bird bred in all six East Anglian counties, as well as in Kent, Sussex, and Devon, but the draining of so many marshlands brought the number of potential breeding places down and only in the nick of time was it saved as a British breeding species by the conservation of a few patches of marshland in Norfolk and Suffolk.

Before the war the number of breeding pairs, in the five or six areas where they were still to be seen, varied between twenty-five and forty pairs, but the bird is not able to withstand spells of severe weather and the winters of 1940-41 and, more especially, 1946-47 reduced its status considerably. In 1947 not a single pair bred at Hickling Broad, in Norfolk, which had previously supported half a dozen or more pairs, and the breeding population for the whole country was no more than four pairs. Fortunately, 1947-48 was a mild winter and gave the bird a chance of regaining something of its lost position, thirteen pairs being known to breed.

Once more, then, there is some anxiety concerning another of our rarer species, but this time inclement weather rather than persecution seems to be the chief cause of present reductions in population. It seems as though there is no immediate danger of the bearded tit disappearing from the British list of breeders, but not until the pre-war population has again been recorded will its status be satisfactory.

If such birds as the kite and bearded tit are watched carefully and their numbers recorded so that we can keep

trace of their fluctuations, another bird is being watched on account of a remarkable spread of breeding territory along the coasts of Britain in recent years. This is the fulmar, a sea bird, whose breeding range is being studied as part of a long-term scheme by members of the British Trust for Ornithology.

Few birds have ever made a more rapid extension of their breeding limits. According to Darwin the fulmar was the commonest species in the world, but its breeding haunts, so far as the British Isles were concerned, were restricted to the remote island of St Kilda until 1878. In that year, however, when a whale was being cut up on Foula, loneliest and rockiest of the Shetland Isles, the fulmars came along and started to breed, and since then there has been a remarkable spread. In 1905 they had reached the mainland of Scotland near John o' Groats; by 1922 they had colonised the east coast as far as Flamborough Head, in Yorkshire. Down the west coast fulmars reached the Isle of Man and St Bee's Head, in Cumberland, in 1941.

To-day, that southward spread continues, with the low cliffs of Norfolk as the southernmost reported breeding post, and reports of birds around the cliffs of Kent and Cornwall during the nesting season. This extending breeding range of the fulmar is certainly one of the most fascinating expansions of recent years and is the subject of special attention.

Keeping track of extending haunts of species and fluctuations in bird population plays a great part in the activities of Britain's ever-increasing numbers of bird watchers. It is indicative of an era in which ornithology has changed from the mere search for the *rara avis* into something much more tangible and real, a science in which a complete understanding of the biotic relationship between bird and man is the ultimate aim, and, in the case of species like the kite and the bearded tit, an attempt to maintain as British breeding birds species once common enough but whose balance has been upset, wittingly or unwittingly, by man and his activities.

SYDNEY MOORHOUSE.

**Art. 4.—COMPLICITY IN AGGRESSION: A PROBLEM
IN INTERNATIONAL LAW.**

At the time of the drafting of the Charter of the International Tribunal for Trial of German Major War Criminals a certain British official is said to have given a warning that, if aggressive war were to be treated as a crime, there was a danger lest accessories as well as principals might get into trouble. In legal theory it is indeed so, even though the Nuremberg Tribunal was successfully steered clear of such embarrassing questions. The new international law under which the leaders of two great sovereign states have been judicially sentenced for the planning and waging of aggressive war is essentially an extension of the principles of ordinary criminal jurisprudence into the international field, and, as such, must bring with it problems of criminal complicity of the kind familiar in the normal administration of justice. The criminal law recognises various kinds and degrees of complicity in a crime, from that of the man who actually assists in committing a burglary to that of the 'accessory after the fact' who helps the burglar to escape subsequent arrest or keep his swag. The application of the concept of complicity to the theory of war as an international crime raises problems which are, or should be, of importance not merely for international lawyers, but for those who frame the foreign policies of Governments, particularly now that it has been laid down by the International War Crimes Tribunals that leaders of states cannot invoke sovereignty to absolve them from responsibility for acts of policy which are in themselves criminal.

In the old international law, when war was legal irrespective of responsibility for starting it, a State A was entitled to remain neutral in a war between States B and C and to recognise the result as soon as it was embodied in a valid peace treaty. Thus, as soon as the cession of Alsace-Lorraine was made by France in the Treaty of Frankfort which ended the Franco-Prussian war in 1871, the new frontier became a part of the public law of nations. A more difficult situation might arise, however, if the Government of State C, being defeated in war by B, refused to submit to the victor, and was finally driven out of its national territory. In this case there was no valid

peace treaty, whereby C gave its legal consent to the changes enforced through war by B, but it was possible for A, at its discretion, to hold that the Government of C was no longer capable of exercising the powers of sovereignty and to withdraw the *de jure* recognition previously accorded to it, transferring this recognition to B as the conqueror of the territory or to some authority designated by B as C's new Government. Such a decision on the part of A was a grave step, and could only be considered legally valid for a neutral, if all organised resistance by C had in fact ceased; otherwise it was a breach of neutrality on behalf of B against C and could even be regarded as an act of war. Withdrawal of *de jure* recognition is in any case the most serious action short of war which can be undertaken by a Government against a foreign Government or State; it is much more serious than mere rupture of diplomatic relations, which normally does not involve any repudiation of the legal right of a State to exist or of a Government to represent it in the international system.

The new international law as declared by the Nuremberg Tribunal—it may be convenient to refer to it as the Nuremberg Standard—is held to date from the signing of the Briand-Kellogg Pact for the Outlawry of War (Pact of Paris) on Aug. 27, 1928. By this treaty, it is claimed, any war not waged strictly in self-defence became a crime. The Pact of Paris did not provide for collective security in the sense that it bound its signatories to do anything to prevent or punish the aggression of others; each signatory severally pledged himself not to resort to war as an instrument of policy. But it was widely felt that the Pact implied at least an obligation not to admit as valid any title created by an act which the Pact had made criminal. Thus it came about that in 1932, after the Japanese had forcibly seized Manchuria from China, the American Secretary of State enunciated the famous 'Stimson Doctrine,' whereby it was laid down that 'the United States . . . does not intend to recognise any situation, treaty or agreement which may be brought about by means contrary to the covenants and obligations of the Treaty of Paris.'

The Covenant of the League of Nations had already forbidden war among its members and had provided a system of sanctions which were intended to restrain an

aggressor by collective international action. Perhaps because of the provision for sanctions, the Covenant did not lay down any obligation not to recognise results of successful aggression; the makers of the Covenant had been unwilling to contemplate such a possibility. But when it had become clear that no sanctions would be applied against Japan over Manchuria, and when the Stimson Doctrine was promulgated in America, the League Assembly by its Resolution of Mar. 11, 1932, required States Members of the League not to recognise any situation, treaty or agreement brought about by 'means contrary to the Covenant of the League or the Pact of Paris.'

The Stimson Doctrine was applied as a principle of American policy until the Yalta Conference in 1945. The Members of the League of Nations also adhered to the non-recognition principle in relation to the Japanese conquest of Manchuria and never gave diplomatic recognition to the puppet State of 'Manchukuo.' But Britain and a number of other European States did recognise, at first *de facto* and later *de jure*, the Italian conquest of Abyssinia after the Abyssinian resistance to the invasion had collapsed and the Emperor had been driven into exile. An important British court case, that of *Bank of Ethiopia v. National Bank of Egypt and Liguori*, also established that, even while the recognition of Italian rule was only *de facto*, Italian legislation for Abyssinia was valid against enactments of the *de jure* sovereign, for it was held that the authority of the emperor was purely theoretical and had ceased to exist in reality. However good this decision may have been in the old international law, it was plainly in conflict with the new conception whereby the Italian conquest was a criminal act and could make no difference to the legal rights of Abyssinia to property abroad. The whole trend of British policy during the Chamberlain period was indeed to go back to a nineteenth-century scheme of international relations and to ignore such 'idealistic' innovations as the League Covenant and the Pact of Paris. The Nuremberg Tribunal, on the other hand, rigorously maintained that aggressive war had been a crime since 1928 and rejected the plea of the defence that the Tribunal's Charter was an act of retrospective legislation.

If the Nuremberg Tribunal had not been a court of the victorious Allies, it could hardly have failed to take notice

of the complicity of certain of the Allied nations in acts for which the Nazi leaders were charged with criminal responsibility. The two obvious cases are the Munich settlement of 1938 and the secret agreement for the partition of Poland attached to the German-Soviet Non-aggression Pact of 1939. As regards the former, the Nazi plan for the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1938 was one of the counts in the indictment for Crimes against Peace. The aim of the British and French Governments at that time had been in the words of Mr Chamberlain himself, 'to find a solution which would not bring about a European war, and therefore a solution which would not automatically compel France to take action in accordance with her obligations.' In other words, France was unwilling to honour her treaty of military alliance with Czechoslovakia if Germany should attack the latter; hence the pressure on the Czechs to submit without fighting and thus save France from the dilemma of either openly repudiating her pledged word or else going to war with Germany. If it had not been for the Franco-Czech alliance, Britain and France could have stayed strictly neutral and allowed events to take their course; as it was, they intervened to reach an agreement with Germany and impose it on the Czechs. The Anglo-French pressure on Czechoslovakia took the form of warning the Czechs that neither France nor Britain would support them if they refused to accept the proposed terms. The Czech delegates who waited outside the conference room at Munich to learn the fate of their country afterwards reported that they were told by a British diplomat: 'If you do not accept this, you will have to settle your affairs quite alone with Germany.'

It is beyond dispute that Britain and France, for whatever political reasons, neither helped Czechoslovakia to resist aggression nor remained strictly neutral, but joined Germany in dictating to the Czechs the cession of the Sudetenland which Hitler was threatening to take by force. This was certainly by the Nuremberg Standard complicity in aggression. It should be observed, however, that it did not go beyond withholding from the Czechs the military aid to which they were by treaty entitled. Britain and France did not themselves undertake, as did Britain and the United States later at Yalta, any direct forcible action on behalf of the aggressor against the victim of aggression.

In the German-Soviet secret agreement for the partition of Poland, Soviet complicity in the Nazi aggression against Poland was that, not of an accessory, but of a principal. At the time, the Russian invasion of Poland was often excused as a counter-occupation designed to prevent the Germans from advancing too far to the east, and it was even represented as a unpleasant surprise for Hitler. We now know from the published text of the secret agreement that it was pre-arranged by agreement between Berlin and Moscow. Whatever may be said of the political grounds on which Russia decided to come to terms with Nazi Germany, or of her claim on ethnic grounds to the eastern provinces of Poland (which was, broadly speaking, neither better nor worse than the German claim to the Sudetenland), the fact remains that legally Russia was bound by her adherence to the Pact of Paris, the Covenant of the League of Nations, and a special Non-aggression Pact which she had concluded with Poland. She disposed of the idea that she was merely carrying out a temporary, preventive occupation, by declaring that the Polish State had ceased to exist and unilaterally annexing the occupied territory to the Soviet Union after bogus 'plebiscites.' The atrocious deportations which carried off over a tenth of the population of Soviet-occupied Poland to slave labour in the Soviet Union merely aggravated the fact of conquest by an aggressive war parallel to, and coordinated with, the German invasion which overran western Poland and started the Second World War. When the Nuremberg Tribunal was set up to try the Nazi leaders for planning and waging various aggressive wars, including the attack on Poland in 1939, some people thought it rather odd that the Soviet Union should be represented on it, and it was perhaps a necessary consequence of this presence of a co-aggressor on the judges' bench that the secret partition treaty was treated at the trial as a skeleton in the cupboard which must never be allowed to emerge. A copy of it was produced by Seidl, the German lawyer defending Hess; it had been given to him by an Allied officer whom he would not name, and as he could not establish its authenticity, the Tribunal refused to admit it in evidence. The original document was all the time in the hands of the Americans, who later on, when the cold war began to get really icy, officially published it along with other captured documents

on German-Soviet relations from the archives of the German Foreign Office.

The Russian invasion of Poland in 1939 is perhaps, however, better regarded as an independent aggression than as mere complicity. Complicity without initiative as a principal is a characteristic rather of the Western democratic states, which indulge in it from time to time from motives of what is called 'appeasement.' The most remarkable example of all since the signing of the Pact of Paris is to be found in an agreement which fell entirely outside the scope of the Nuremberg trial, namely the settlement of the 'Polish Question' achieved by Marshal Stalin, President Roosevelt, and Mr Churchill at the Yalta Conference in 1945. At the same conference the three statesmen decided to set up the international tribunal for bringing the leaders of Nazi Germany to what the American prosecutor in his opening speech at Nuremberg described as 'the first trial in history for crimes against the peace of the world.' Thus, whatever validity there may have been in the Nuremberg defence plea of *Nullum crimen sine lege* for acts of aggression committed between 1928 and 1945, there could be none for the statesmen of Yalta. By their own law, which they proposed to apply to the Nazi leaders, they should be judged for what they did to Poland.

After Hitler's attack on Russia in June 1941, Russo-Polish diplomatic relations were resumed by a treaty which formally annulled the Russo-German public treaty for the partition of Poland (the one concluded after the defeat of Poland) and pledged Russia to release all Polish prisoners of war and deportees in the territory of the Soviet Union. In resuming diplomatic relations Russia accorded the Polish Government-in-exile the *de jure* recognition which had already been given it by the British and Americans, and also renounced any possible claim in international law to the territory annexed from Poland. Nevertheless, after the victory of Stalingrad had rendered it no longer necessary for the devil to be a monk, the Soviet Government in a note of Jan. 16, 1943, asserted that the annexed territory was part of the Soviet Union and that all Polish prisoners and deportees who remained in Russia (that is to say, all who had not managed to get out when the army of General Anders was transferred to the Middle East) were Soviet citizens. About the same time it was announced in Russia

that a new Polish army would be formed there under the authority of a committee of Polish Communists who repudiated any control by the Polish Government in London. Relations with the latter were broken off in April on the pretext that it had shown an anti-Soviet attitude in requesting an investigation by the International Red Cross of the fate of the 10,000 Polish officers whose corpses were found in the Forest of Katyn.

In the months following Russia laid down as conditions for a resumption of diplomatic relations with Poland that Poland should immediately cede to Russia nearly half her pre-war territory and that the Head of the Polish State, President Raczkiewicz, and several Cabinet Ministers should resign. In reply to British and American pressure for acceptance of these terms, the Poles pointed out that to cede the territory in the middle of the war without waiting for a post-war general peace conference would be disastrous for the morale of the Polish army in North Africa (nearly all of whose personnel, owing to the circumstances of its formation, came from the eastern part of Poland) and that to select or dismiss Cabinet Ministers on Russian demand would mean acknowledgment of vassalage to Russia. As the Polish Government refused to yield on either point, negotiations for resuming diplomatic relations were still at a deadlock when the Russians in pursuit of the retreating German armies re-entered pre-war Polish territory at the beginning of 1944. The situation was certainly an awkward one for Britain and the United States, whose relations with Russia were in any case none too good. But the legal position was clear enough; the Western Allies were bound not to recognise either a unilateral annexation of territory to which Poland had not consented or a Communist-directed administration imposed on the rest of Poland by force of Russian arms. Yet this is exactly what they did.

From the spring of 1944 Russia waged aggressive war a second time on Poland by systematic killing or deportation of members of the Polish 'Underground State' and Home Army which were loyal to the Government in London. Without waiting for the restoration of diplomatic relations the Polish Government had ordered the Home Army, the most highly organised resistance force in any occupied country of Europe, to disclose itself and aid

the Russians when they arrived in Poland. A section of the Home Army took a prominent part in the capture of Vilna, but then it was treacherously surrounded and disarmed by the Russians, most of its officers shot, and the men either deported to Russia as prisoners or compelled to enlist in the Communist-led 'Berling army'—most of whose officers at that time were Russians. This story was repeated many times as the Russians advanced through Poland. A British officer who had escaped from a German prisoner-of-war camp into Poland has described how he saw a trainload of prisoners going eastward into Russia, about half the load being Germans and the other half Poles of the Home Army who had been fighting against the Germans; the Russian guards treated both equally as enemies. In the end the Home Army went underground again, but only in very few cases did it offer any armed resistance to the Russians, for it had no desire to impede Russian operations against Germany. But non-resistance did not save Poles loyal to the Government-in-exile from Russian violence. The Russians required obedience to the group of Polish Communists and stooges known as the 'Lublin Committee,' which they set up to administer Poland west of the annexation line and subsequently recognised as the Provisional Government of Poland. In addition to enforcing the authority of the Lublin Committee by means of their own troops and military police, the Russians organised and armed the Communist section of the Polish resistance movement (which had previously been insignificant in comparison with the strength of the Home Army) as the Security Police of the new regime, modelled on the Soviet N.K.V.D.

The British and American Governments were fully informed of what was going on in Poland, and legally they could not regard it as anything but undeclared war waged by Russia on Polish soil against the properly appointed civil and military agencies of the Polish Government. At Yalta, nevertheless, President Roosevelt and Mr Churchill agreed to withdraw *de jure* recognition from the Polish Government in London and transfer it to the Lublin Committee, described as 'the Provisional Government now functioning in Poland,' on condition that the latter was 'broadened.' The Polish Prime Minister had already been informed three months previously that such 'broadening' meant a Cabinet

in which the 'Lublinites' would have three-quarters of the seats, including the key positions, that is to say, the premiership, foreign affairs, and control of the army and police; this is what was in the end carried out. The Government thus formed was ironically to be called the 'Provisional Government of National Unity.' No mention was made in the Yalta treaty of the Government which Britain and the United States had recognised *de jure* since 1939 and with which they were still in diplomatic relations. It was laid down that the 'Provisional Government of National Unity' must pledge itself to hold free elections, but there was no clause giving the Three Powers the right to supervise these elections, so that, if the Lublinites broke their pledge, there was nothing for the two Western Powers to do except to protest. Their failure to withdraw their ambassadors after the scandalous faking of the Polish elections in January 1947 finally disposed of the idea that Britain and the United States had intended to make their recognition of the Soviet-imposed regime conditional on the actual holding of free elections (as distinct from a promise to hold them). The American Ambassador, however, then had the moral courage to resign, and his book 'I saw Poland betrayed' gives a description of the reign of terror in Poland under a Government in which all real power from the beginning had been in the hands of the Communist Security Police.

The withdrawal of *de jure* recognition from President Raczkiewicz and his Cabinet in 1945 was a much more serious matter than its withdrawal from the Emperor of Abyssinia in 1938, though both were equally acts of recognition of results of aggression. It could not be claimed that the Polish Government in 1945 was unworthy of recognition merely because it had been driven from its national territory, for Britain and the United States had recognised it in that condition since 1939. Further, the Government-in-exile had fully formed cadres of State administration, controlled an army, navy, and air force abroad numbering approximately 200,000 men, and maintained continuous close contact with the Underground State and Home Army within Poland. It was indeed just because Poland in January 1945 still had so much capacity for moral and political resistance, if not for open war, that it was so urgent to 'get the Polish question out of the way' before

Germany surrendered. But in undertaking to liquidate that part of the Polish State which Russian military power could not reach, and thus to break the Polish will and ability to resist, Britain and the United States involved themselves in a very high degree of complicity in the Russian aggression. They did not merely recognise an accomplished fact, but took active steps to complete its accomplishment.

The former Polish Ambassador in Washington has recorded that he was constantly told at the time by State Department officials that the United States had only two alternatives: to yield to Russian demands or to go to war with Russia. This was, and is in all such cases, a false dilemma. The Western Powers had no obligation to go to war for Poland against Russia, but they did have an obligation to withhold the moral and material benefits of *de jure* recognition from the aggressor's nominees as rulers of Poland. It is clear that, if the Nuremberg Standard is to be admitted in international law, the transfer of title to an aggressor or his nominees can no longer be regarded as an act of sovereignty which creates legal right while being itself immune from legal judgment. Such transfers of title involve a criminal liability for those who make them, and they can be no more valid in law than contracts about property which is known by the parties to have been stolen.

It will be said, no doubt, that this is 'mere legalism,' and takes no account of the realities of international politics. But what is really meant by those who decry 'mere legalism' in this matter is that there are now two systems of international law which are quite incompatible. This situation is indeed very confusing, not only for academic teachers and students of international law, but also for practical politicians who would like to know whether their proposed actions are legally criminal or not. It may be difficult to clear up all such uncertainty, but it would at least be helpful if in future any public personage referring to international law would specify whether he means by it the law as majestically expounded by the International War Crimes Tribunals or

' . . . the ancient rule, the simple plan
That he should take who hath the power and he should
keep who can.'

G. F. HUDSON.

Art. 5.—BERNARD SHAW'S ORIGINS.

Sixteen Self Sketches. By Bernard Shaw. Constable, 1949.

As the years have gone on, more and more information about Mr Shaw's origins has become available, supplied chiefly by Mr Shaw, but it has never been put together properly.

His family lived in Scotland originally, and then came to England. Towards the end of the seventeenth century Captain William Shaw went to Ireland and fought for William in the Battle of the Boyne, and as a reward a large grant of land in Kilkenny was made to him. There the Shaws lived a life of ease, comfort, and security, hunting, fishing, and shooting.

In 1736 Robert Shaw married Mary Markham (she was not, as Shaw was informed, the sister of the Archbishop of York, and Shaw is therefore not descended from Cromwell). They had a son, William, who married a daughter of a clergyman. These in turn had a son, Bernard. In the 1790's Bernard left the ancestral home, took up law, and, in 1802, he also married a parson's daughter. He became a freeman of Dublin. He was an Orangeman, but his sister was an abbess. His cousin Robert entered the Irish Parliament, refused a bribe to vote for the Union, founded a bank which came to be known as Shaw's Bank, and was created a baronet in 1821. He took a family seat called Bushy Park outside Dublin. Our Bernard Shaw's cousin, the late Charles Macmahon Shaw, wrote that Sir Robert 'had the appearance of a somewhat truculent bear disturbed out of a doze : there was an arrogant air about him, combined with a curious lack of assurance, like one who armours his sensitivity with a cruel exterior. It was certainly only an exterior cruelty, for he was a kind and honest gentleman.'

Shaw's other immediate senior relatives on his father's side were extraordinary people. They were small Irish gentry ; poor, but keeping up appearances and family pride. They had among them a hilarious humour.

The wife of the former Bernard, cousin of the baronet, had fifteen children in twenty-two years. When her husband died in 1826, eleven were living. Despite some-

what straitened circumstances, she carried on indomitably, helped by Sir Robert, who found her a cottage in a suburb called Terenure, not far from Bushy Park. She brought up her children as Protestants, aristocrats, and Unionists.

The third son was George Carr. When he was a boy, he was once cruel to a cat. He remained throughout his life conscience-stricken: he warned his son that no man capable of the act deserved or could have any good fortune or happiness afterwards. He was full of self-reproaches and humiliations when he was not full of secret jokes, and was 'either biting his moustache and whispering deep-drawn damns, or shaking with silent paroxysms of laughter.'* He was a soft, easy-going person, with little sense of ordinary responsibility and, as has been indicated, with a strong, and in some ways peculiar, sense of humour. His misfortunes—and they were many and great—he regarded as some of the funniest things in life. During his whole lifetime he was never seen to read anything more profound than a newspaper, but he must have done some reading in his youth, for he knew Scott's novels. After losing his first job—a clerkship in an ironworks—he was, by 'influence' of course, given a sinecure in the law courts, but a few years later the sinecure was abolished and he was pensioned off with 60*l.* a year. He realised it in cash, and became a grain merchant, without any knowledge whatsoever of the trade; he seems to have done this in a spirit of levity and amusement at his outrageous unfitness for the work. His income was two or three hundred a year, on which he tried to keep up family pride, and was always expecting something to turn up. In the words of his son, 'He was of sardonic mien, this concealing a profound sensibility.' He inherited a family squint. It was operated on—by the father of Oscar Wilde, who made it worse in the opposite direction.

He inherited more than the family squint. The sensibility was also in the family and it had led some of them to drink. 'My father was in principle an ardent teetotaler but in fact was the victim of a drink neurosis which cropped up in his family from time to time: a miserable affliction, quite unconvivial, and accompanied by torments of remorse and shame. Nobody ever felt the disgrace and

* Bernard Shaw in a letter.

misery and endless mischief of drunkenness as he did.' 'He was a lonely drinker at the grocer-publican's. When stupefied with alcohol, he was apt to fly into momentary rages in which he would snatch up something and dash it to the floor.' 'I inherited a comedic love of anti-climax from my father.' Shaw has paid his father a moving tribute woven round the fact that he was a man of really profound humility.

There was in the neighbourhood a small landowner called Gurley (the name was originally Gourlay, so the family was probably at one time Scotch). He had a daughter, Lucinda Elizabeth ('Bessie'). His wife died and the daughter was brought up in very strict respectability by an aunt. She had mental vigour, was emancipated, humane, able: she was musical. Shaw once wrote, 'From my mother I derive my brains and character.'* Her interests lay outside the home and she was incommoded by displays of family affection. She was not 'of the marrying sort.' The father married a second time when his daughter was grown up. On the wedding morning he was arrested for debt on the suit of his first wife's brother. As the latter had learnt of the marriage from Gurley's daughter, she was blamed for the arrest, and the father made her position so unpleasant that, with a view to escaping from it, she became engaged to George Carr Shaw. When the engagement was announced, the fiancée's relatives denounced him to her as a drunkard, and she put the question directly to him. 'His eloquence and sincerity,' wrote Bernard Shaw, 'convinced her that he was, as he claimed to be, and as he was in principle, a bigoted teetotaller.'

Having come to Shaw's parents, we may review his racial and national ancestry. It included people of both the Mediterranean and the Nordic races. The former is shy, sensitive, artistic, mentally nimble, and the latter melancholy and practical. Lord Samuel has described the former type as having flashes of intuition, brilliant improvisation, a disrespect for cold fact, a love of the dramatic; and the latter type as having common sense and careful judgment, dogged pertinacity and staunch loyalty. There was plenty of the Mediterranean race in Shaw's ancestry,

* Sydney Olivier wrote of her as 'admirable and astonishing.'

but of course he was right when he said that he also was 'an Irishman of the Danish, Norman, Cromwellian and Scotch invasions.'

George Carr Shaw and his fiancée found a house in Upper Synge Street, now Synge Street, Dublin. Upper Synge Street, with its five-roomed, kitchen-basement, yellow-brick houses, was a street of merchants, not opulent but of social pretensions superior to those of shopkeepers. The home in Dublin was only a mile from Bushy Park.*

George Carr Shaw was forty and his fiancée twenty-two when they married. When they were on their honeymoon, the bride opened the bridegroom's wardrobe and found it full of empty bottles. In the shock of this discovery she ran to the docks (they were in Liverpool) to get a job as a stewardess and get out of the country, but on the way she was molested by some rough docklanders and turned back.

George Carr Shaw and his wife had first a daughter, Lucinda (Lucy) Frances, and then another daughter, Elinor Agnes. Bernard Shaw once wrote :

'My mother began with two girls and finished with me. To make a man of genius you require practice. You practise on girls—say, two girls; and then, having formed the habit of making girls, when you try a boy, you start him as a girl before you recollect what you are about, and only get in his sex at the last moment, with the result that he is a monster who writes plays because he is a hero or a heroine on paper as he chooses.'

Shaw was born on July 26, 1856. He was baptised in the then established Protestant Episcopal Church by a clergyman uncle. His godfather was intoxicated and did

* Sir Robert was soon afterwards succeeded by his brother Frederick. Frederick Shaw had defeated O'Connell at the polls and entered Parliament with enormous prestige, which was enhanced by his gift of oratory, his obvious ability and, above all, by his complete integrity. For twenty years he represented Dublin University with distinction and when in 1846 Peel offered him the Secretaryship of Ireland, the appointment was universally acclaimed. It was the more bitter that at that moment he was struck down with a severe attack of rheumatic fever which left him permanently crippled and made a political career impossible. He showed real greatness in his attitude to his misfortune. He refused to be soured by it, he made no complaint, but turned with dignity and fortitude to other forms of service. He became Recorder of Dublin. He was a man of great personal dignity and old-fashioned courtesy and had high standards. He insisted on the responsibility which belongs to the privileged, the duty of generous service. He said, 'It is the privilege of a gentleman to get the worst of any bargain throughout life.' His second son married a Frenchwoman, became the father of Flora Shaw (Lady Lugard), and was made a General.—'Flora Shaw,' by E. Moberly Bell, pp. 12-14.

not appear : the officiating uncle told the sexton to act in his place.

'Of intimate or emotional bonds between parents and children or between sisters and brother there appears to have been no trace whatever.' *

'My mother was embittered because she expected money to be left to her and it didn't happen, and we all suffered for it.' Shaw's mother had no vocation for marriage or motherhood. Against the constraints and tyrannies, the scoldings and beatings and punishments she had suffered in her childhood she reacted with righteous indignation. She was incapable of striking a child or an animal, hating even to see a flower thrown away or picked to pieces, but it never occurred to her that children needed guidance or training, that it mattered what they ate or drank or what they did so long as they were not actively mischievous. In general, 'living to her was not an art : it was something that happened. So she accepted me as a natural phenomenon, and took it for granted that I should go on occurring in that way.' The little boy was left to the tender mercies of nursemaids and was surreptitiously taken to the slums. The effect of this on the child was to engender an æsthetic disgust at poverty and its accompaniments that affected his later life profoundly. When Shaw was a little older, he regarded it as a privilege to go out with his mother.

Writing of his father to Ellen Terry in 1897, Shaw said, 'One night, when I was still about as tall as his boots, he took me out for a walk. In the course of it I conceived a monstrous, incredible suspicion. When I got home, I stole to my mother, and in an awestruck whisper said to her, "Mamma, I think Papa's drunk." She turned away with impatient disgust and said, "When is he ever anything else ?" ' 'The wrench from my childish faith in my father as perfect and omniscient to the discovery that he was a hypocrite and a dipsomaniac was so sudden and violent that it left its mark on me. It is only a rhetorical exaggeration to say that I have never since believed in anything or anybody.' †

* M. J. MacManus in 'G.B.S. 90,' p. 37.

† 'Sixteen Self Sketches,' p. 12. 'My father impressed the evil of drunkenness so deeply upon me in my early years that I have been a teetotaler ever since.'

'My father got drunk at dinner parties and it was impossible to invite him again, or his wife without him.' One result of the family being dropped socially was that Shaw did not have the experience of social intercourse and lacked education in social manners. 'Impecuniosity, ostracism, three children, a house rented at 30*l.* a year or thereabouts, a drunken husband * obviously incapable of much success as a merchant: this was the lot of my mother. My mother was forced to enjoy her own society and I inherit liking to be left to myself. My mother never had a friend and never made the least effort to win my affection, and I certainly made no effort to win hers.'

Although it was his mother who was the musical parent, there was some interest in music on his father's side of the family. 'My father, armed with a trombone, and in company with some two dozen others of ascertained gentility, used to assemble on summer evenings on the riverside promenade on the outskirts of my native town and entertain their fellow-citizens with public-spirited minstrelsy.' † Uncle William played the ophicleide.

A teacher of music called Lee came to live in the next street and Mrs Shaw went to him to have her voice trained. 'He had black side-whiskers, a chin, and was lame, and his personality was mesmeric.' His impact on the Shaw household was terrific. From this time on, nothing counted there but music. Lee was an indefatigable organiser of concerts and amateur opera and he regarded Mrs Shaw as a discovery. Being a man of talent as well as a born teacher, he got the most out of her voice and soon she was appearing in all his productions as his prima donna.

Singing rehearsals were naturally held in hearing of Shaw. The atmosphere in which he lived was full of 'artistic actinic rays, the invigorating ozone of musical criticism, musical appreciation and high performance.' Shaw was profoundly influenced by music. As in the case of Samuel Butler, it has been the dominant influence in his life. He once wrote: 'In music you will find the body

* A fit eventually stopped Shaw's father taking alcohol. 'Only three out of eleven Shaws drank; and two of them, my father and William, suddenly gave it up long after their cases seemed hopeless.' Shaw had a maternal uncle who was a dipsomaniac, blasphemous, and Rabelaisian, even when talking to Shaw as a child.

† 'Music in London,' II, p. 9.

and reality of that feeling which the mere novelist can only describe to you: there will come home to your senses something in which you can actually experience the candour and gallant impulse of the hero, the grace and trouble of the heroine, and the extracted quintessence of their love.'

Shaw has told us that his father warned him not to play with children of people in retail trade. There were two social frontiers: between wholesalers and retailers and between Roman Catholics and Protestants, and 'my first childish doubt whether God was really a good Protestant was raised by the observation of the sad fact that the best voices for the rendering of the works of great composers had inexplicably fallen to Catholics. Even the divine nobility was openly put to question, for it could not be denied that some of these singers were connected with retail trade.'

A governess, Caroline Hill, taught Shaw to read and write, and taught him very well.* He was taken to church, and sent to Sunday School every Sunday.

'The first book I ever possessed was a Bible bound in black leather with gilt metal rims and a clasp, slightly larger than my sisters' Bibles because I was a boy and was therefore fitted with a bigger Bible precisely as I was fitted with bigger boots. In spite of the trouble taken to impress me with the duty of reading it (with the natural result of filling me with the conviction that such an occupation must be as disagreeable as going to church), I acquired a considerable familiarity with it and indeed once read the Old Testament and the four Gospels straight through, from a vainglorious desire to do what nobody else had done. A sense of the sanctity of clergymen and the holiness of Sunday, Easter and Christmas—sanctity and holiness meaning to me a sort of reasonless inhibitory condition in which it was wrong to do what I liked and especially meritorious to make myself miserable—was imbibed by me, not from what is called a strict bringing-up, but straight from the social atmosphere.'†

'When I first read "Great Expectations," I was not much older than Pip was when the convict turned him upside down in the churchyard. My first acquaintance with the French Revolution was acquired at the same age

* Late in life, Shaw suddenly realised his debt to her and became a subscriber to the Governesses' Benevolent Institution.

† 'Our Theatres in the Nineties,' III, p. 35.

from "A Tale of Two Cities," and I also struggled with "Little Dorrit" at this time. The books impressed my imagination most fearfully, so real they were to me. Now it is pretty clear that Dickens, having caught me young when he was working with his deepest intensity of conviction, must have left his mark on me very deeply.*

The next formal tuition that Shaw got was in the house of his uncle-in-law, Wm. Geo. Carroll, Vicar of St. Bride's, Dublin, the first Protestant clergyman in Ireland to declare for Home Rule, where, with Carroll's two sons, he learnt Latin grammar.

The Lee-Shaw alliance produced a result other than musical which brought to the boy some of his finest experiences. Eight or nine miles to the south of Dublin, on Dalkey Hill, there was a cottage which Lee bought in 1866, when Shaw was ten, for Mrs Shaw for the summer. 'The hill overlooked both Dublin Bay and Killiney Bay and is one of the loveliest spots in a lovely coastline. There, for the first time, young Shaw was able to drink in natural beauty without stint. He roamed over the gorse-clad hillside until every rock and every goat-path † was familiar; he looked over the blue waters to Howth Head; he lay on the grassy summit, looking at the curving shore of the bay—a bay that Dubliners are fond of comparing with the Bay of Naples to the latter's disadvantage. He would race down to a spot on the sandy shore known as the White Rock and plunge into the waves. It was on Killiney beach that he acquired the passion for bathing that he retained till he was nearly eighty. A mile and a half to the north lay Kingston Harbour, one of the gateways of Ireland. ‡ Mr Shaw has written:

'For brilliance of colour, making rocks, rain-pools and herbage like terrestrial jewellery, I have seen nothing like the heights of Sligo Bay. And for magic, that takes you out, far out, of this time and world, there is Skellig Michael, ten miles off the Kerry coast, shooting straight up six hundred feet, sheer out of the Atlantic. Whoever has not stood in the graveyards at the summit of that cliff among these beehive dwellings and their beehive oratory does not know Ireland through and

* 'Music in London,' II, p. 316.

† The scene has been immortalised in James Stephens's 'The Goat Paths.'—R.F.R.

‡ M. J. MacManus in 'G.B.S. 90.'

through. It is the beauty of Ireland that has made us what we are. I am a product of Dalkey's outlook.'

Lee's brother, with whom he shared a house, died, and Lee suggested to the Shaws that they should go and live with him. They accepted and moved to 1 Hatch Street in 1867, when Shaw was eleven. The arrangement was entirely free from any suggestion of sex.

Shaw was so well taught by his uncle that when, in 1867, when he was eleven, he was sent to the Wesleyan Connexional School (the only significance in the title was its Protestantism), he at once rose to the head of the First Latin Junior. But he was not a good schoolboy: he often truanted. He at least got interested in the stories of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. His father encouraged him to read. Shaw read 'The Pilgrim's Progress' to him. He dominated his schoolfellows by his power of telling stories and his courage in calling their bluff when physical violence was threatened, although he was not physically courageous.*

His first literary effort contributed for publication that we know of was a short story sent to a boys' journal: it dealt with piracy and highway robbery and had as a leading character a wicked baritone in opera: 'it was about a man with a gun attacking another man in the Glen of the Downs: the gun was the centre of interest to me.'

At the age of twelve or thereabouts Shaw was fond of long words. We have a glimpse of him at this time when, with a companion, he set fire to gorse on Torca Hill. An innocent boy was arrested, so Shaw called on the owner of the land and by eloquence obtained an acquittal.

The boy's literary and general æsthetic sense developed with phenomenal rapidity. Shakespear and Bunyan, Byron and Shelley, and a host of other classics he read and re-read. Through the libretti of operas he got to know foreign literature—Victor Hugo and Schiller through Donizetti, Verdi, and Beethoven; Goethe through Schumann; Beaumarchais and Molière through Mozart; Mérimée through Bizet; and Berlioz proved an unconscious interpreter of E. A. Poe.

* 'When it turned out later that I was a born Shakespearian genius, I flattered myself that Nature, alias Providence, alias The Life Force, had given me in my boyhood an excessive regard for self-preservation lest I should throw away my genius in some pugnacious adventure.'—'Sixteen Self Sketches,' p. 109.

In the home the boy also had access to illustrated books on painting, which sent him to the Irish National Gallery, where he studied pictures with his fresh mind and was stimulated to read Vasari. Even then this gallery was one of the world's more important lesser collections and the pictures were nobly housed. Shaw was especially interested in Italian and Flemish art. He has written, 'I have been mainly influenced by works of art in my artificial culture, and have always been more consciously susceptible to music and painting than to literature, so that Mozart and Michelangelo count for a good deal in the making of my mind.' As a boy, he wanted to be a painter like Michelangelo. Here again, in pictorial art being the second great influence upon him and in having no conscious vocation for literature, Shaw was like Samuel Butler.

After a year or two the clerical uncle examined Shaw and found his education unsatisfactory. Shaw was sent to a very private school in Glasthule, between Kingston and Dalkey.

One summer evening, when Shaw was wandering on Dalkey Hill under the stars,

'I suddenly asked myself why I went on repeating my prayers every night when, as I put it, I did not believe in it. Being thus brought to book by my intellectual conscience, I felt obliged to refrain from superstitious practices; and that night, for the first time since I could speak, I did not say my prayers.' 'My moral passion was developed only after I stopped saying prayers. Up to that time I had not experienced the slightest remorse in telling the most incredible lies, but with the coming of the urge for telling the truth for its own sake I found my true vocation.'

'It was not until I became a cynical blasé person of twelve or thirteen that I read "Pickwick," "Bleak House," and the rest of Dickens.'* 'Dickens, in his own department the most gifted writer since Shakespear, was dominated by a social conscience.'

In 1869, when Shaw was thirteen, he was sent to the Central Model Boys' School in Dublin, undenominational in theory but in fact Roman Catholic. Thus he lost caste, becoming a boy with whom no Protestant young gentleman

* It will be remembered that it was some five or six years before that he had read 'Great Expectations,' 'A Tale of Two Cities,' and 'Little Dorrit.'

would speak. But what weighed in Shaw's mind against the school was that he mistakenly thought that it was for children of poor people, and this formed in him a complex comparable to that formed in Dickens by his being sent to work in the blacking factory. He attended from February till September and then struck. Shaw himself has lent colour to the theory that this experience of black, burning shame gave a bias to his whole life, making him a rebel against social inequality.

He was then sent to the Dublin English Scientific and Commercial Day School. He became joint head boy.

At the age of fifteen Shaw could neither play nor read a note of music, but he could sing or whistle from end to end leading works by Handel, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Rossini, Bellini, Donizetti, Mendelssohn, and Gounod, and knew enough of a considerable number of painters to recognise their works at sight. He has written,

'In my small-boyhood I by good luck had the opportunity of learning the Don thoroughly, and if it were only for the sense of the value of fine workmanship which I gained from it, I should still esteem that lesson the most important part of my education.'*

Shaw's environment in the wider sense corresponded in some respects to England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. One can walk for miles in Dublin in a completely Georgian scene. The English language of Dublin

* 'Music in London,' I, p. 296. According to Lillah McCarthy, Shaw always declared that his master in drama was Mozart. At the Malvern Festival in 1939 he said: 'My method, my system, my tradition, is founded upon music. It is not founded upon literature at all. I was brought up on music. I did not read plays very much because I could not get hold of them, except, of course, Shakespear, who was mother's milk to me. What I was really interested in was musical development. If you study operas and symphonies, you will find a useful clue to my particular type of writing. If you want to produce anything in the way of great poetic drama, you have to take a theme, as Beethoven did in his symphonies, and keep hammering at the one theme.' Edmund Wilson, in his essay on Shaw in 'The Triple Thinkers,' finds in the plays 'a logic and grace, a formal precision like that of the eighteenth century composers,' and, analysing the structure of 'The Apple Cart' in terms of the scoring for a small orchestra, speaks of Shaw's plays as the 'music of ideas.' Maurice Colbourne, in 'The Real Bernard Shaw,' 1949, writes that there is a musical quality about Shaw's prose, that acts in his plays—the last of 'Geneva' and the first of 'Good King Charles,' for instance—often suggest the structure and sweep of symphonic movements, and that the third act of 'Man and Superman' is a music drama for four voices, tenor, soprano, baritone, and bass.

was in its Augustan phase and Shaw thus imbibed from the oratory of its people a distinction of literary style.

A reminiscence of Shaw's boyhood is as follows :

'I was born with an unreasonably large stock of relations, who have increased and multiplied ever since. My uncles and aunts were legion, and my cousins as the sands of the sea without number. Consequently, even a low death-rate meant, in the course of mere natural decay, a tolerably steady supply of funerals for a by no means affectionate but exceedingly clannish family to go to. Add to this that the town we lived in, being divided in religious opinion, buried its dead in two great cemeteries, each of which was held by the opposite faction to be the antechamber of perdition, and by its own patrons to be the gate of Paradise. These two cemeteries lay a mile or two outside the town. Now the sorest bereavement does not cause men to forget wholly that time is money. Hence, though we used to proceed slowly and sadly enough through the streets or terraces at the early stages of our progress, when we got into the open, a change came over the spirit in which the coachmen drove. Encouraging words were addressed to the horses ; whips were flicked ; a jerk all along the line warned us to slip our arms through the broad elbow-straps. Many a clinking run have I had through that bit of country. But in the immediate neighbourhood of the cemetery the houses recommenced ; at that point our grief returned upon us with overwhelming force : we were barely able to crawl along to the great iron gates. On the way, a cousin would tell me a romantic tale of an encounter with the Lord Lieutenant's beautiful consort in the hunting-field (an entirely imaginary incident) ; an uncle would give my father an interminable account of an old verge watch which cost five shillings and kept perfect time for forty years ; and my father would speculate as to how far the deceased was cut short by his wife's temper, how far by alcohol, and how far by what might be called natural causes.' *

In 1871, when Shaw was fifteen, in the 'Vaudeville Magazine' in September appeared the following reply to a correspondent : 'G. B. Shaw, Torca Cottage, Torca Hill, Dalkey, Co. Dublin : You should have registered your letter : such a combination of wit and satire ought not to have been conveyed at the ordinary rate of postage. As it was, your arguments were so weighty that we had to pay twopence extra.'

* 'Music in London,' III, pp. 152-54.

In this year Lee went to London for good. The financial situation of the Shaw family thus becoming impossible, Mrs Shaw went to London, taking the daughters.* The furniture at Hatch Street and the cottage at Dalkey were sold, and Shaw's father and he went into lodgings. Having the introduction of his Uncle Frederick, chief of the Land Valuation Office, Shaw became office boy in the office of a prominent estate agent at the wage of eighteen shillings a month.

Being deprived of music in his home, Shaw set himself to learn the piano—and began by sitting down to play an opera. In spite of this unorthodox method, by persistence he acquired proficiency.

He had a boy friend called McNulty,† and when the latter removed to a distant place, there ensued an immense correspondence between them including sketches, drama, etc. This was greatly useful in the development of Shaw.

On his childhood Shaw wrote to Ellen Terry, 'O a devil of a childhood, Ellen, rich only in dreams and loveless in realities.' 'I never knew love when I was a child. My mother was so disappointed in my father that she centred all her care on my [younger] sister, and she left me to fend for myself.‡ If I had not returned to the house, I don't think they would, any of them, have missed me.' 'I am afraid the fact that nobody cared for me particularly gave me a frightful self-sufficiency, or rather a power of starving on imaginary feasts.' In notes which Shaw was kind enough to write of a syllabus of lectures I issued, he said, 'I was horribly shy and diffident, producing an impression of brazen impudence because, I suppose, the ability of which I was unconscious asserted itself through the disadvantages and the ignorance of which I was too conscious.'

* 'I am myself the fruit of an unsuitable marriage between two quite amiable people who finally separated in the friendliest fashion and saw no more of one another after spending years together in the same house without sharing one another's tastes, activities, or interests. They and their three children never quarrelled: though not an emotional household, it was not an unkindly one. Its atmosphere of good music and free thought was healthy; but as an example of parental competence to guide, educate, and develop children, it was so laughably absurd that I have been trying ever since to get something done about it.'—'Everybody's Political What's What?'

† Afterwards author of three original and remarkable novels of Irish life published by Arnold of London.

‡ 'My gratuitous meddlesomeness must be a reaction to her non-attachment.'

Such a one is bound to be an ugly duckling: there was bound to be friction. The intellectual was his means of salvation, and he suffered from the fact that, to adapt words of his own, his very love got knit into an intellectual fabric that wounded when it meant to caress. 'My people knew me too well on my worst side and not at all on my best.' In his novel, 'Love Among the Artists,' Shaw wrote of 'the hard lesson that is inevitably forced on every sensitive but unlovable boy who has his own way to make and who knows that, outside himself, there is no God to help him'—the lesson of learning to stand alone in the world.

In the office in which Shaw worked, a young man remarked that every fellow thinks he is going to be a great man until he is twenty. Shaw, telling this to Henderson, his biographer, said, 'The shock that this gave me made me suddenly aware that this was my precise intention.'

The work in the office was rich in opportunities of insight into society and its workings. One of Shaw's duties was to collect weekly rents, ranging from a shilling to half a crown, from a dozen houses. After Shaw had been in the office about a year, the cashier, hearing that a legacy had been left him, lent himself money out of the firm's and falsified his accounts and was detected before he could pay. Shaw was so efficient that, in spite of his extreme youth, he was, in the emergency, put on to do the cashier's work, his salary being increased to 48*l.* a year. He felt obliged to don a morning-coat suit to look impressive enough. The engagement of a mature cashier was first delayed and then dropped. Shaw changed his sloped, straggling, boyish handwriting into an imitation of the script of his predecessor.

Shaw described his work as including

'the receipt and payment of the rents, charges, insurances, private debts, etc., on many estates, with occasional trips to the country to collect rents. My employers acted also as private bankers and, to a certain extent, confidential agents to their clients, and hence I became accustomed to handling large sums of money, meeting men of all conditions, and getting glimpses of country house life behind the scenes.'

'On fifty estates,' wrote Frank Harris, 'he had to pay head rents, quit rents, mortgage interests, jointures, annuities, insurance premiums, and what not.' It was

part of his duties to pay the Dublin bills of country clients and he began by paying them on his way back from the bank, calling at shops and paying across the counter. To his surprise he was handed a percentage on the amount of the bill. He refused to accept it because he 'could not bear the indignity of tips from shopkeepers,' so he stopped calling on them and left them to call for the money.

Lodging in the same house as Shaw and his father was a physician, Chichester Bell. The latter's father had taught elocution at Shaw's school. Chichester Bell's uncle was Alexander Bell, of Visible Speech fame, and father of Graham Bell, the inventor of the telephone. Chichester Bell had studied chemistry and physics in the school of Helmholtz in Germany. He was particularly interested in pathology. With Shaw he discussed Tyndall, Trousseau's 'Clinical Lectures,' and phonetics. He was musical, and so far ahead of his contemporaries that he knew something of, and appreciated, Wagner as a great composer. Later in his life Shaw wrote, 'I can remember when I was a boy being introduced to Wagner's music by hearing a second-rate military band play an arrangement of the Tannhäuser march. And do you suppose it was a revelation to me? Not a bit of it: I thought it a rather commonplace plagiarism from the famous theme of Der Freischütz.' Under Chichester Bell's lead, however, he bought a vocal score of 'Lohengrin,' the only one available in Dublin: the first few bars completely converted him.

In 1875, when Shaw was eighteen, Moody and Sankey, the famous evangelists, visited Dublin and made a great impression. Shaw had a letter signed 'S.' published in 'Public Opinion' attacking the mission. His uncles were shocked.

He was reacting against his environment. At the end of his teens he read Shelley, prose and verse, from beginning to end.

Of his youth in Ireland Shaw wrote later, 'When I was a boy, I was a coward and bitterly ashamed of it. I was disabled for many years by imagining that everybody knew as much as I did and could do everything rather better. My bane has always been diffidence. I was wise enough to be overwhelmed by my ignorance, and innocent enough to imagine that I was the only ignoramus in the world.'

Speaking of this time, he wrote three years later that he was uncomfortable in an atmosphere of 'Toryism,

Protestantism and snobbery,' the Irish varieties of which were to him 'particularly objectionable.' 'Further,' he went on, 'my employer, on discovering that I held heterodox opinions in Church matters, had extracted from me a promise not to attempt to propagate my views among his clerks, and at twenty I felt less inclined to hold such a post on such conditions than at sixteen.' When Shaw was supplanted as cashier by a nephew of a member of the firm, he wrote to the principal :

' Dear Sir,

I beg to give you notice that at the end of the month I shall leave your office.

My reason is that I object to receive a salary for which I give no adequate value. Not having enough to do, it follows that the little I have is not well done : when I ceased to act as Cashier I anticipated this, and have since become satisfied that I was right.

Under these circumstances, I prefer to discontinue my services and remain

Very truly yours

G. B. SHAW.*

Shaw's younger sister had developed consumption, caught from reckless contacts with a housemaid at a time when consumption was not regarded as infectious, and she died.

Of his youth in Ireland Shaw has said, 'My home in Dublin was a torture and my school was a prison and I had to go through a treadmill of an office.' He wrote to a cousin, 'If you had been through that time with me, you would not see anything to joke about.' 'As far as I had any resolutions or intentions at all, I left Ireland because I realised there was no future for me there. Dublin was a desert. London was the centre of literature, art and music.' On the expiry of his notice Shaw went to London and lived with his mother and sister.

There is a third remarkable parallel between the lives of Shaw and Samuel Butler, namely, both had loveless homes and childhoods and were lonely and diffident. It would appear that they found compensation in art and, later in their lives, as executants in the art of writing.

R. F. RATTRAY.

* These facts were brought to light by Dr F. E. Loewenstein in 'Adam,' August, 1946.

Art. 6.—CHEKHO-SLOVAKIA: FORMERLY, YESTERDAY, AND TO-DAY.

CZECHO-(or CHEKHO-*)SLOVAKIA, superficially and professedly a State created on a racial basis, was and is really composite, imperfectly united. Its racialism was incoherent and disputed. Even in its Slavonic majority it was essentially divided. And the large and powerful German and Magyar minorities were, of course, in strong and definite antagonism to the Slavs.

Chekho-Slovakia was a creation of yesterday—one of the new 'little nations' that arose out of the chaos left by the First World War; and it arose largely because of the Entente policy at the end of that war. For this policy demanded the break-up of the Hapsburg state, the former Austrian Empire. In a word, Tschekhei-Slovakei owes its existence to the burning anti-Germanism and anti-Magyarism of the 'winning side' in the Versailles settlements of 1918-21.

That winning side was in no mood to consider any of the objections to or cautions about the 'liquidation' or 'Balkanisation' of the Dual Monarchy. Their dominating wish and aim was to entrench and fortify every serviceable area of the nationalisms hostile to Teutonic and Hungarian ascendancy; and they vigorously pursued and realised that aim.

The Germans could indeed appeal, not only to their strong existing minority in Bohemia and Moravia, but also to the age-long incorporation of those Chekh lands in the 'Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation'; in the German *Bund* or Confederation of post-Napoleonic Europe (1815-66); and in the Austria—dominantly Germanic—which continued the Hapsburg tradition after 1866-67, but now in alliance with a completely equal Hungarian partner.

The Chekhs retorted, with the smiling approval of those who were now 'Stewards of the Judgment.' They had much to say. They pointed out that the remote Teutonic occupation came to a natural end in and after

* In keeping the spelling 'Chekh,' rather than 'Czech,' I am following the advice and direction of my first teacher in Slavonic languages, the late Professor W. R. Morfill. I agree with him that 'Cz' often misleads.

the fourth and fifth Christian centuries, when the Germans poured into the Roman provinces of the West, and when Slavs poured into the vacuum thus created.

They could not deny that from about 925—from the later time of Henry the Fowler, the founder of the great German state of the Middle Ages—some form of Teuton domination and inclusion was imposed on these Chekh lands and peoples. Indisputably they had to some extent been subjects of the German *Reich*, the German *Bund*, and the German Hapsburgs. But they could and did lay powerful stress on the old historic antagonism of Chekh and German—and on the long-continued, oft-repeated, efforts of the Chekh race to escape from any and all German domination, and even connection.

They pleaded, naturally enough, that in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and especially fifteenth centuries these efforts seemed not without hope of ultimate success. And they reminded the arbiters of Europe (in those days of Clemenceau, of Woodrow Wilson, and of Lloyd George) that in the past hundred years, from 1815 to 1918, they—'Old Chekhs' or 'Young Chekhs'—had more and more boldly, passionately, and effectively struggled (like the Irish Nationalists within the British orbit) for their own Nationalism, for Home Rule, and even for, or at least towards, absolute separation.

The Chekh demands (like those of the Poles, the Rumanians, and the Yugoslavs), were realised with a fulness, not to say an extravagance, probably beyond the hopes of most, possibly beyond the desires of some, of their leaders.

A State of enormous and unnatural length, but of moderate breadth, was called into being. It stretched from the Fichtel Gebirge, slightly west of Marienbad, almost to the Bukovina. And besides Bohemia and Moravia—Chekh lands, Slovak lands, and German 'colonial' lands—it included some Ruthenian land ('Carpatho-Ruthenia') politically outside the Russian borders but racially belonging to that stock.

It is well within the memory of most now living how uneasy and troubled was the life of Chekho-Slovakia in the next eighteen or nineteen years. For not only was the German minority a veritable Ulster in this Continental Ireland—with a people ever straining at the yoke which

bound them to the Chekhs whom they despised and hated. Something similar might also be said of the Slovaks and even of the Ruthenes. Slovakia had been fairly content with the Magyar home in which she had lived so long. The Chekh Republic was not so utterly attractive to her. It was even detested by many of these 'Little Brother' Slavs. And the Ruthenians were perhaps almost as tepid, if not as resentful, towards the Prague Government.

It is only ten to eleven years since the German Nationalist revival under Hitler and his Nazi party first weakened and crippled Chekhia by the 'liberation' of the Bohemian and Moravian Germans in 1938; and then completely shattered Chekho-Slovakia by the events of March 1939. Chekhia then becomes a German Protectorate. Slovakia emerges partly as a sort of Free State, in dependent alliance with the Reich, and partly reverts to Hungary.

But we know well how all this is again undone by the results of the Second World War. For now not only is Hitlerite Germany, the Third Reich, laid in ruins, but a Russian domination is spread like a flood over immense areas of Central Europe. Up to and beyond Berlin; up to Vienna; over all Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Eastern Germany, and (in essentials) also over Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and finally over Chekho-Slovakia, the deluge spreads. The Russian overflow produces sooner or later, but rapidly enough in any case, absolute Russo-Communist governments and ruling parties in all these countries.

In Chekho-Slovakia the Benes regime (undermined in 1938 and abrogated in 1939) was at first restored in 1945—in close friendship, of course, with Russia but without the installation of complete Russo-Communism.

Only too well we know how recently such a Communism has been enthroned there also. Only too well we recognise how, there too, the customary attributes of such a regime have displayed themselves.

The perversion of justice; the violation of human rights; the systematic cruelties of slave labour and other infamies, have not perhaps been carried quite so far in the Communist Chekh State as in other Russian Satellites. But they have gone much too far already.

I will try to justify this lament by some of the most recent history.

In the early spring of last year (March 10) Prague

Radio felt it advisable, or necessary, to deny that 30,000 workers were to be deported to Russia; or that vast slave labour camps existed in Chekho-Slovakia; or even that wagon-loads of 'undesirables' had been sent to Siberia—which country, added the wireless announcer, is 'no longer a convict settlement' but a 'prosperous land.' (Unfortunately North Asiatic Russia is both. Ever since the latter days of Alexander III (1891-94) the Tsardom began to transform this 'great neglected country' into a freer, richer, and more 'prosperous land.' Free colonisation enormously increased in the last twenty-five years of the Old Autocracy. And the Great Siberian Railway—one of Witte's finest achievements—was a witness to all the world of the new life and force. But something of the old penal element continued, though now overshadowed and minimised. And there is only too much reason to fear that the importance of slave labour and transportation has terribly revived and increased for years past in Bolshevik Siberia—as in European Russia.)

Part of the official denials at least may be justified. But at this time (March-April 1949) there was in any case so much disaffection and disorder—and the simmerings of revolt were so threatening—that the Government insisted (April 5) on special measures for the security of Prague itself. Among manual workers the special 'shock' battalions were often 'surrounded by an atmosphere of hostility.' *Go slow* tactics were rampant in many localities. 'The solidarity of the slackers must be broken.' So declared the chief Communist daily newspaper of Chekhlant, which a little later demanded that 'Shock-workers and Nationalisers' must be protected against the Backward, the Bureaucrats, and the 'Conservative' Managers.

Rather specially the Universities needed attention. Opposition among students must be 'liquidated.' Ten thousand of the 'politically unreliable' had been expelled: the worst of these were to be put to 'productive work' (or 'forced labour'?).

There had recently been quite an exodus of the dissatisfied and the rebellious of various classes. Seven thousand persons were known to have fled the country and many others had followed in their steps. (So protested 'Rude Pravo' on February 26, 1949.)

As in Russia, as in other Satellite lands, Chekho-

Slovakia is now indulging in violent, often hysterical, and usually amusing, polemics against 'capitalist' countries—above all against America. Hereon, upon the United States of the North, a worthy Chekh traveller was descending recently (e.g. April 16). To him the 'full and rich life' of Chekh-land compared most favourably with the 'horrible emptiness' of existence in the unhappy fatherland of the dollar—where all relationships were based on money; where individuality was systematically discouraged (!); and where lunacy so abounded that eight millions of mad people were said to be found therein (!).

All this sounds somewhat like an echo of contemporary invective in Russia, where a legal specialist, in this very month, was demonstrating to his own satisfaction how American crime was an offspring and result of the nature and essence of capitalism.

In late April (April 25—St Mark's Day) Archbishop Beran, the Chekh Primate—destined speedily to follow in the steps of Cardinal Mindszenty—replied to 'certain slanders' already or soon to be in circulation: 'In the near future it will be said that I am an enemy of the People. . . . I proclaim . . . that I have never been, and that I will never be, an enemy of the working class.'

Yet, despite such avowals, matters steadily grew worse for the Archbishop. He has been put under house arrest. He has been forbidden even to send out circulars. An agent of Government has been introduced into his palace and keeps his person and his papers under surveillance.

By the middle of May a regular campaign of religious persecution had also begun in Slovakia. Various monasteries and nunneries had been closed; monks and nuns had been arrested; religious schools had been closed or nationalised. Thus reports the Vatican radio in a protest against this tyranny (May 14).

A few days later (May 24) the Archbishop of Prague protested afresh against State action towards the Church. The Minister of Education had brought out a 'Gazette of Catholic Clergy.' And Monsignor Beran suspected that the Communist Government was really aiming at the evolution of a new National Church, non-Papal and non-Episcopal.

This fear must have been strengthened by the declara-

tion of the Minister of Information four days later (May 28). For herein he warned the Vatican and all the clergy that the State reserved the right to educate its children in the spirit of 'Marxist-Leninism.' And the same tone was maintained by the chief Government-sponsored Press organs.

Thus, despite occasional words of conciliation in the official 'Gazette of the Catholic Clergy' (for which the Ministry of Education was responsible), the chief Communist newspapers continued to fulminate (like 'Rude Pravo' on June 6): 'No Government can tolerate the issue by another organisation of directions at variance with the Constitution. . . . The Catholic Church is doing this in our country.'

When at last the Pope, in last midsummer, excommunicated all active promoters and willing adherents of the Communist-sponsored 'Catholic Action' movement, the Prague Government responded with a series of measures severely limiting the powers of the Vatican; of the local hierarchy in general; and of Archbishop Beran in particular. And the Minister of Justice, Cep'licka, with his customary injustice, reopened his violent attacks upon the Church. The Papal Nuncio, Monsignor Verolino, came in for a double portion of this abuse, whose generosity was stimulated by Slovak happenings. For here, among the strongly Catholic peasantry of this province, the Papal envoy presumed to travel in the course of this summer, rousing thereby intense official suspicion and resentment. He was shadowed and, as he complained, 'molested' by police. Irritation on both sides reached such a pitch that the Nuncio a little later resigned and left the country.

Meantime the secret radio 'Voice of Slovakia' was busy all these weeks urging Catholic Slovaks to free themselves from Chekh and Russian tyrannies with all their anti-Christian spirit. And, on the other side, Communist Government and Party leaders were eloquent in demanding ever stricter measures against 'reaction,' 'defection,' and 'deviation.'

Three new concentration camps were added to those already existing about this time. They had accommodation for quite 3,000 favoured persons. And a little later some of the old camps, developed and abandoned by the German Nazi occupation, proved their usefulness afresh

by housing Greek rebels in flight from Hellas and from unfriendly Yugoslavia.

We may note that when the Chekh authorities claimed the adhesion of some 1,700 priests for the 'Catholic Action' movement, Rome retorted that such membership had either been extorted by threats or obtained by the simple and delightful expedient of enrolment without knowledge or consent. Such forgeries perhaps threw a new light on the venerable proverb 'What's in a name?'

In its struggle with the Church the Government even started State-sponsored pilgrimages and ecclesiastical festivities, especially in commemoration of John Hus and the ninth-century 'Apostles of Moravia,' Cyril and Methodius. At the same time they continued their menaces and repressions with vigour. Treason trial was fiercely threatened against any priest who acted on the Papal excommunication of Communists. And a ferocious sentence of eight years' penal servitude was bestowed on the priest who (in a famous case widely quoted) had refused the last sacraments to a Communist woman if she persisted in her Communism. He was simply obeying his Pope and his Bishop—but he was disobeying Prague—and this was his reward. (For the woman, unexpectedly recovering, had denounced him.)

Among the often ruthless and barbarous purges now undertaken to rid the country of 'reaction' in Church and State, one is perhaps curious enough to deserve special notice.

This is the book-purification of parish libraries ordered on May 3—quite in the spirit, and almost in the letter, of Caliph Omar's legendary directions for the Alexandrian Library.

All books not conforming to Marxist ideology were now to be destroyed. Persons retaining forbidden books were to be treated as if illegally hoarding arms or ammunition.

Similar purges of public and private libraries had just been completed.

And again, at the army manœuvres of July and August in Slovakia (ending on August 13), General Svoboda not only declares, as Minister of Defence, that the military forces of the Republic must imitate the Soviet army—'by whose side we will again fight should need arise'—but *orders those military forces of Chekho-Slovakia to support*

the Government's Committees of 'Catholic Action.' Here surely is the rule of religion with the strong hand worthy of any despot of old.

Yet all in Chekhia is not mere tyranny, organised injustice, boastful falsification. In May and June, in language noted even by British leading journals, the Chekh Communist Premier, Zapotocky, expressed himself with remarkable frankness and fearlessness. He confessed to a deep dissatisfaction with his working-class followers. They 'could not yet claim the benefits of revolutionary change.' They must work hard 'either to progress or to perish.' Both quantity and quality must improve. And again, on June 5, 'If the present standard . . . is all we can achieve,' our sacrifices 'would be futile. . . . We need ten times as much'—in rations. And on June 4 he even declared: 'Are you building up the Country? That is the matter—not Whether you are Communist or Non-Communist.'

With surprising docility the Government organs now also began to preach cooperation between Conformists and Non-Conformists. And they vehemently echoed Zapotocky in condemning the poor quality of so much of Chekho-Slovak industrial production (e.g. on June 4).

On May 18, 1948, a typically 'embittered' Chekho-Slovak, who had escaped to territory under British control, wrote a characteristic letter to a friend describing conditions in Bohemia, Moravia, and Slovakia under Communist tyranny: 'A handful of Thugs, worse than the *Gestapo*, bully the . . . people. . . . Those who possessed houses, factories, farms, and land . . . were robbed of everything.' Country houses had been turned into houses of recreation for the children of Communists or into sanatoria *exclusively* for working-class people. Only Communist party members or registered members of the working-class could now be treated at spas or watering places. No child of a 'capitalist' was now permitted even to continue University studies. All University students, even of the proletariat, must pass a test of loyalty before examinations. Dependence on Russia was so great that the Prague Government had little say in great political questions.

To retain power, bribes were systematically thrown to the 'workers.' Thus, really, did government go on.

Public funds were squandered. Reserves were becoming exhausted. 'But people begin to see the fallacy of it all.'

Neither in this letter from a refugee, which I have just summarised, nor elsewhere in this article have I, perhaps, laid sufficient stress on the penal cruelty of the regime or on its intellectual blindness and perversity.

As to the former, it is only right to say that Chekho-Slovakia in this its last phase may, perhaps, claim a record of somewhat more humanity and somewhat less ruthlessness than Russia herself—or than Poland or Rumania, Bulgaria or Hungary—under 'People's Democracy.' Yet (as in other Satellite countries) arrests, treason trials, espionage charges, arbitrary imprisonments, death sentences and executions have become, in Communist Chekhia, such ordinary incidents of daily life as to become a most acceptable offering to the Moloch of Moscow and to the spirit of Bolshevism. 'The vessel of Revolution,' said Marat, 'can only arrive in port on a sea reddened with waves of blood.'

On June 18, 1948, the Government seemed anxious to demonstrate through the Prague Radio that even here there were moments of clemency. *During the last twelve months*, it announced, 166,000 persons had been 'amnestied.' Of these 68,000 had been under sentence of penal servitude for one year or less; 1,463 under penal servitude for longer time. Prosecutions of 72,900 persons had been dropped. (These figures did not include military offenders.) But, surely, this table of indulgences has another side to its professions of 'Mercy'? Does it not also show something of the harshness of its 'Justice,' the extreme severity of its political Orthodoxy?

And do we not also get a suggestion of the same kind from the facts that in May last 107,000 Chekh Communists were expelled from the Party; and that fresh warnings were given against the 'penetration' of 'hostile foreign influences'?

Or, again, do we not derive the same impression from the speech of Slansky, General Secretary of the Chekh Communist Party, on September 5 last, when no longer inveighing against the Church but addressing a central political school of Young Communists?

'Anyone,' says the orator, 'who has deviated, however slightly, from Marxist-Leninism, is bound to be dragged

with the speed of an avalanche into the Capitalist camp.'

As to intellectual outlook, we may note the typical declaration of a Prague newspaper on August 24: 'We no longer want scientists who are simply scientists.' The regime, in other words, wanted men of science who were keen Communist politicians. 'The Republic does not need chemists,' said Robespierre. And this *arrière pensée* is still more frankly, illiberally, and indeed fanatically expressed at a Congress of Mathematicians held in Prague at the close of this same month of August. (It is, however, expressed by a Polish woman visitor. We may almost hope that there were not too many Chekhs who would say such a thing.) '*Mathematics*,' declared Madame Krasowska, Vice-Minister of Education in Communist Poland, '*can only be developed on the basis of Marxist-Leninist philosophy.*'

This is a precious utterance and should not be forgotten. The narrowness, myopia, and bigotry of extreme political partisanship could hardly express themselves more perfectly.

It is curious but indisputable that of late years Bolshevik Russia has largely reverted to ideas and practices, methods and ambitions, of Tsarism. In Russia itself, though not at all in its Satellites, it has restored nationalist and racialist patriotism, minimised and somewhat scorned by Lenin. It has disinterred from books, documents, and monuments of history the heroes of the Tsarist times. It has instituted 'Orders' of Suvorov and Kutusov. It has dressed itself in the plumage of great Tsarist conquerors. In a measure, despite its traditional Atheism or Agnosticism, it has restored the Russian Orthodox Church as a political and social weapon. And it has rediscovered Panslavism.

In the name of Panslavism immense and long continued efforts were made under the Tsardom to draw Bulgars, Serbs, Croats, Slovaks, Chekhs, Slovenes, and even Poles into the Russian orbit in support of Russian ambitions. In some quarters these efforts failed—as always in Poland; as in Bulgaria after 1881-84; as predominantly in Slovakia; and as, partially, in Croatia. But with Serbs and Chekhs they had a marked success. The Chekh response, indeed, was early and historic. To some extent

it was lineally descended from the late mediæval tradition of Bohemian independence. It was increasingly active and defiant from 1845-48. After 1866 this defiance was doubled. The weakness of Austrian Germandom was the opportunity of Chekh Slavdom.

Few men, perhaps, in recent generations, even in recent centuries, have been ultimately responsible for more unrest, disorder, unhappiness, and false conception than Karl Marx. But, at long intervals, he uttered some thoughts of wisdom. And thus he warns his, normally deluded, readers against the mirage of Panslavism.

'This ridiculous anti-historic movement,' he bursts out in his 'Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany,' 'was born in the studies of . . . Slavonic dilettanti. It aims . . . at the domination of the civilised West by the barbaric East; of the Towns by the Countryside; of Trade, Industry, and Science by the primitive Agriculture of Slav serfs.' But behind this wild theory, he continues, there stood 'the terrible reality of the Russian Empire.' And that Empire claimed 'the whole' [say 'more than half'] of Europe for the Slav race, and 'quite especially' for the only powerful branch of this race, the Russians. Knowingly or unknowingly Panslavists regularly worked in the interests of Russia and 'betrayed the Revolution.' Yet the Communist Revolution in the Soviet world has enlisted Panslavism in its service.

RAYMOND BEAZLEY.

Art. 7.—ASIAN NATIONALISM.

THE nineteenth century was the age of nationalism in the Western world. Nationalism was the most potent force in the life of the people, exerting more influence than religion. It dominated the thinking of the statesmen, moulded the achievements of the scholars and men of letters, directed the course of the Industrial Revolution, was the mainspring of much revolutionary ardour, caused the breakdown of great Empires, and included among its consequences the two world wars of the twentieth century. In its effects on the lives of the people, it must be classed with the expansion of Islam, the Reformation, and other great movements in human history. It was closely linked to other political forces such as Democracy, Liberalism, Communism, and Imperialism, and it affected their development.

The twentieth century is the age of nationalism in Asia and Africa. For more than half the world's people nationalism is to-day a dominant creed, is advocated as an all-embracing philosophy of life, a universal remedy.

What is nationalism, this force which contains within itself such potentialities for good or evil, peace or war, prosperity or poverty, freedom or slavery ?

The problem of understanding what *nationalism* means is, in part, a linguistic one. Many people fail to discriminate between *people*, *country*, *nation*, and *state*. Some of the words derived from *nation* have different meanings according to the context. Thus *national* is used in England as the adjectival form of *nation* (e.g. the National Book League) and *state* (e.g. the Ministry of National Insurance). *Nationalist* has meant at different times 'an advocate of Irish self-government,' 'a believer in self-determination,' and 'a person who exalts his own nation at the expense of others.' '*International*' has three quite different meanings when followed by 'footballer,' 'opera singer,' and 'affairs,' and a fourth if preceded by the word 'Third.' *Nationalism* itself has been used to mean 'the policy of bringing industry under control of the state,' and, in America, to mean the policy of strengthening the Federal Government at the expense of the states ; and some writers use it when prefixed by the word 'economic' to mean 'self-sufficiency' or 'autarky.' *Nationalise* is

used, in India at any rate, to mean increasing the share of the citizens of a state in some enterprise. *Native* is frequently used to mean 'non-European.'

The confusion is increased when some of these words are translated into other languages. Thus the French *nation* has in it political elements which are absent in English. The German word *nation* has, in part, a cultural connotation, and during the inter-war period there was a tendency to use *volk* where British would use *nation*. The Italian *nazione* was often used by the Fascists where a writer in English would have used *state*.

There are further complications when we come to the languages of the East. The Indian phrase *Swaraj*, which really means 'self-rule,' has often been quite wrongly translated as 'nationalism.' The two Chinese words *Min-Tsu*, which are usually translated into English as 'nationalism,' literally mean 'people's race.'

The word *nationalism* in the modern ideological sense has only been in use for about a hundred years, and only in common use for about forty or fifty years. Especially after the First World War, with the Wilsonian emphasis on the right of all peoples to self-determination, nationalism became a popular political slogan the vagueness of which seemed to encourage rather than prevent its excessive use.

The fact that *nationalism* is difficult to define has not prevented men and women from being passionate adherents and advocates of nationalism. Men will work, fight, and die for a slogan or an idea even though they may have only the vaguest notion of what it means. One student of the subject has written that 'the ideas which move men politically do so in virtue of their force and their appeal, and not because they are clear or accurate. Ideas are likely to be influential almost because they are vague. . . .'

Perhaps the simplest way of finding out what nationalism means is to study the origin and development of the idea. Two hundred years ago David Hume wrote an essay on the formation of national character. Hume pointed out that it is not possible 'for any set of men to converse often together, without acquiring a similitude of manners, and communicating to each other their vices as well as virtues. . . . Where a number of men are united into one political body, the occasions of their intercourse must be so frequent, for defence, commerce and government, that,

together with the same speech or language, they must acquire a resemblance in their manners, and have a common or national character.'

Hume was writing in the middle of the eighteenth century before the entities which are to-day called nations had come to full fruition. Certainly most people believe that nationalism did not exist as a political force before the French Revolution, although some writers have seen in the long history of the Jewish people the seeds at least of modern nationalism. Professor E. H. Carr maintains that 'the founder of modern nationalism as it began to take shape in the nineteenth century was Rousseau, who, rejecting the embodiment of the nation in the personal sovereign or ruling class, boldly identified "nation" and "people".'

It was in the French Revolution that the idea found practical expression. The political thinkers who paved the way for the Revolution had emphasised the rights of man not only to choose the form of government under which he would live, but also the political unit to which he desired to belong. Thus began the century of nationalism in Europe. Groups of oppressed people, conscious of their nationality, united to translate this consciousness into a political fact.

One of the first of the nineteenth-century scholars to examine the problem of nationalism was a German, Professor J. K. Bluntschli of Heidelberg University, in his important study 'The Theory of the State,' first published in 1852. His view was that nationalism 'as a definite political principle' had been of importance only 'since about 1840,' although 'at all times in the history of the world nationality has had a powerful influence on states and on politics.'

He believed that it was a mark of the advance of civilisation that national rights were being recognised. Of these, he regarded language, 'the strongest bond which unites its members,' as the most fundamental right of a nation. Other national rights which he emphasised were the 'right to observe its own customs,' the right to its own laws, and the right to its own moral and intellectual life. In defence of these a nationality was entitled to struggle. 'Men can have no juster cause for resistance to tyranny,' he wrote, 'than defence of nationality.'

John Stuart Mill, in his treatise on Representative Government published in 1861, discussed the question of nationality as it affects government. He argued that 'free institutions are next to impossible in a country made up of different nationalities.' He considered the problem of what exactly constitutes a nationality, and reached this conclusion: 'A portion of mankind may be said to constitute a Nationality if they are united among themselves by common sympathies which do not exist between them and any others—which make them cooperate with each other more willingly than with other people, desire to be under the same government, and desire that it should be government by themselves or a portion of themselves exclusively. This feeling of nationality may have been generated by various causes. Sometimes it is the effect of race and descent. Community of language, and community of religion, greatly contribute to it. Geographical limits are one of its causes. But the strongest of all is identity of political antecedents; the possession of a national history, and consequently community of recollections; collective pride and humiliation, pleasure and regret, connected with the same incidents in the past. None of these circumstances, however, are either indispensable, or necessarily sufficient by themselves.'

The year after the appearance of Mill's treatise, Lord Acton published his essay on Nationality. He regarded the theory of nationality as a 'retrograde step in human history' and 'more absurd and more criminal than the theory of socialism.' Yet he recognised the significance of the idea. 'It has an important mission in the world,' he wrote, 'and marks the final conflict, and therefore the end, of two forces which are the worst enemies of civil freedom—the absolute monarchy and the revolution.'

In 1877 Ernest Renan, the great French scholar, delivered in Paris his famous lecture entitled 'Qu'est-ce qu'une Nation?' Renan rejected the view of Mills that ties of race, language, religion, or geography are the main elements in the formation of a nation. His conclusion was that nationality is a spiritual principle deriving from two roots: the root of common memories, which may sometimes include memories of failure and defeat, and the root of common desire to maintain a certain way of life.

By the time of the First World War many people had

come to believe that the force of nationalism was dead : but that this was a delusion was soon made clear by the result of Woodrow Wilson's emphasis on the right of self-determination. Between the two world wars nationalism increased in extent and intensity, especially in Asia. It was a universal phenomenon, no longer confined to the Western world. What had started as a Western idea was now a world force.

The question 'What constitutes a Nation?' has troubled scholars and politicians for a century or more. As the idea of nationalism had developed, it has become increasingly clear that a nation is an extremely complex unit of society, compounded of many elements. All that can be said with certainty is that there are many factors which *can* go to make up a nation. In the following pages I want to analyse some of the characteristics of modern nationalism, illustrating these characteristics with specific examples from Asia.

Many leading nationalists regard racial purity as the main and essential element which goes to make up a nation, in spite of the conclusions of scientists that racial purity is such a rare thing in the modern world as to be inapplicable to the vast majority of nations. It is odd that political leaders have been able to exploit this delusion of racial purity for nationalist ends in the teeth of the overwhelming scientific evidence that most nations are an amalgamation of different races. Struggling national groups have often clung to the belief that they are racially of pure blood and that there is a fundamental race differentiation—physical, mental, and moral—between themselves and other national groups. This conviction of racial superiority is, of course, much easier to see in other nations than in one's own. Its absurdity becomes obvious when we consider the two giant national states of our day, the United States and the Soviet Union, each of which is proud to proclaim itself a racial melting-pot. To a greater or lesser degree every modern nation is similarly a racial melting-pot. As Sir Ernest Barker has pointed out : 'A nation is not the physical fact of one blood, but the mental fact of one tradition. A gulf is fixed between the race and the nation. The one is a common physical type : the other is a common mental content.'

The perversion of the facts of ethnology, which was a common feature of European nationalism of the nineteenth century, has also taken place in Asia. Dr Sun Yat-sen, who was often called the Father of the Chinese Republic, was himself misled into thinking that the inhabitants of China formed one pure racial group. In one of his lectures on Nationalism he said that 'for the most part, the Chinese people are of the Han (or Chinese) race with common blood, common language, common religion, and common customs—a single, pure race.' He asserted that the Chinese race numbered 400 million, together with a few million Mongolians and Tibetans, a million or so Manchus, and just over a million Mohammedan Turks, making a total alien population of less than 10 million. In fact, the non-Chinese inhabitants of China number some 60 million or more people, representing considerably more than 10 per cent. of the total population. In addition to Manchus, Moslems of Turkish origin, Mongols and Tibetans, there are several million tribal people such as the Miaos. Dr Sun's lectures were delivered a quarter of a century ago when less was known about the science of races and about the inhabitants of China than is known to-day. But many of Dr Sun's errors were repeated by Chiang Kai-shek in his book 'China's Destiny,' which was at one time the virtual bible of *Kuomintang* China.

When people speak the same language they undoubtedly develop a feeling of kinship and unity. The existence of a common language is, consequently, a fact in the making of a nation. A Chatham House study group concluded that, of the factors making for nationalism, language 'is the most obvious and important, and is also the one most frequently found.' A national language has become a symbol of national independence leading to the identification of a nation with a language group. Moreover, ardent nationalists not only insist on the domination of the national language over all rivals but sometimes demand the incorporation in the nation of those speaking the same language while living outside the national borders. It is, however, obvious that the use of a common language is by no means essential to the formation of a nation. The people of Switzerland, for example, use four different languages: and almost every nation includes among its citizens one or more minority groups which do not

habitually use the national language. There is no evidence that this *in itself* weakens the consciousness of nationality or acts as a disintegrating force.

The growth of nationalism in Asia has been accompanied by a strong emphasis on the importance of using an indigenous language. Much of Asia was colonised by Western powers, and this almost always resulted in the official language of a colonial country being European. The Asian nationalist who wished to see his country attain independent stature usually discouraged the use of a European language, but the question often arose as to what indigenous language should be used in its place. This problem was specially acute in India where several different, though similar, languages are in use. Indian nationalists have constantly advocated the use of indigenous languages, but the difficulty is that English is nearly always used by educated Indians, and on one important occasion Pandit Nehru apologised in the Indian Constituent Assembly for using English because he found it easier than Hindi. One of the difficult problems involved in the secession of the Moslem areas of India was that Bengal, though inhabited by Moslems and Hindus, was a single linguistic unit.

China has the advantage of having a uniform script even though it is spoken in several dissimilar dialects. Great progress has been made in recent decades in spreading the use of a national tongue, based on the dialect of Peiping. The mass migration of coastal Chinese to the West during the war greatly accelerated the use of this national dialect. As with the racial question, Dr Sun Yat-sen had some curious ideas about the Chinese language and asserted that 'if foreign races learn our language, they are more easily assimilated by us and in time become absorbed into our race.'

In addition to ties of race and language, adherence to a common religion is an important factor in the growth of nationalism, although until recently most people maintained that the influence of religion in the development of nationalism was waning. This belief in the declining influence of religion in politics needs modifying in view of the creation since the war of two new states based on religious solidarity—the Moslem State of Pakistan and the Jewish State of Israel.

Religion remains an important element in the growth

of national feeling, and has been successfully exploited by political leaders. Dr Sun Yat-sen even made the curious assertion that 'people who worship the same gods or ancestors tend to form one race.' In Japan, also, religion has been an important element in the growth of nationalism. State Shintoism, until recently the official religion of Japan, was in fact a perverted form of Buddhism. During the period of the Tokugawa Shogunate (1603-1868) the Emperor lived in seclusion, exercising little more than sacerdotal functions. At the time of the Meiji Restoration in 1868 the Emperor was invested with temporal as well as spiritual authority, and became the focus of loyalty of the Japanese people. Legends were unearthed which purported to show that the Imperial Dynasty was descended from the sun goddess. Thus came into existence the myth of Imperial Divinity with which the Japanese people were systematically indoctrinated. The Meiji Constitution declared that divine authority was vested in the Emperor. 'The rights of sovereignty of the State, We have inherited from our Ancestors, and We shall bequeath them to Our descendants,' declared the Preamble to the Constitution. Chapter I, Article III, stated that 'the Empire of Japan shall be reigned over and governed by a line of Emperors unbroken for ages eternal.' Half of the Meiji Constitution was concerned directly with the privileges and rights of the Imperial House. Shinto literally means the Way of the Gods, and is an amalgamation of primitive Buddhism with ancient animist beliefs indigenous to Japan, the whole being exploited for nationalist ends. Religion and politics became inseparable. Every Japanese citizen was expected to accept State Shinto whatever other religion he professed. This involved Emperor worship and other patriotic ritual. Allied to this was the Japanese form of militarism known as *Bushido*, the Way of the Warrior. This exalted the military virtues of the Japanese people and the divine mission of the Japanese nation. It seems that the defeat of Japan in the recent war did not greatly affect the veneration paid to the Emperor, but the myth of his divinity was exploded and State Shinto was abolished by decree of General MacArthur.

Although not as important as the three factors already discussed, geography and the possession of a home and of common territory undoubtedly play a part in the creation

of national feeling. This view has sometimes been questioned by those who cite the example of the Jews and the Gypsies who were able to maintain their nationality even without a homeland and when widely scattered throughout the world. The evidence of Jewish and Gypsy national feeling, however, supports the view that none of the factors which can be present in national feeling is indispensable, but that different factors are at work in different cases. In the case of the Jews, religious tradition has obviously been a dominating factor, but even with them there has always been the conviction that one day the scattered nation would be united in Israel.

In view of the important role of geography in the evolution of nationalism we should expect to find that exiled and foreign-born Asiatics have played an important part in the development of national movements. It was the great genius of Dr Sun Yat-sen that he was able to weld into one cohesive organisation the diverse elements of the Chinese communities abroad, and the success of the Chinese Revolution in 1911 was largely due to the support and financial backing of the overseas Chinese. In a similar way Indian nationalists living in the United States, Britain, Germany, and elsewhere were invaluable allies of the nationalists in India. Exiled Koreans kept the flame of Korean independence alive while their homeland was occupied by Japan, and in Southern Korea since the liberation a leading role in political life has been played by Syngman Rhee, the late Kim Koo, and other Korean nationalists who had lived abroad.

When people live together under the same form of government they tend to develop similar ideas. That is why the existence of common political practices and traditions is a factor which strengthens national feeling. It is significant that the national movements of Asia very largely coincide with the political boundaries which were arbitrarily fixed by European conquerors. There is a Burmese nationalism and an Indonesian nationalism, but there has hitherto been no serious and sustained advocacy of a nation uniting all the Thais or all the Malays of South-East Asia.

National movements tend to revolve around personalities. These personalities may be mere figureheads, as was the Emperor of Japan, or they may be active leaders,

like Pandit Nehru. It is often difficult to determine the extent to which those who are acclaimed as leaders are, in fact, the architects or the instruments of the movements to which they belong. It is undoubtedly a fact that those who lead national movements are often driven to policies of extremism by the exuberance of their own supporters rather than by personal conviction. In Europe the existence of a monarch, by providing a focus for national feeling, often increased the intensity of nationalism. Although this same principle has operated in Asia, there is one fundamental difference. Most of the national movements in Asia have been directed against European colonialism, and the European powers against whom these national movements were directed have often made use of 'indirect rule.' Instead of imposing a comprehensive Western administration on the colonial territory, the European power made use of existing native institutions. The consequence was that Chiefs, Sultans, Rajahs, and Princes were confirmed, within certain limits, as rulers with wide powers. Thus these native rulers became associated in the popular mind with alien rule, and were often divorced from the popular national movements. 'A deeply significant element, therefore, in the spread of nationalism,' writes Rupert Emerson, 'is that it has meant the substitution of a new style of leadership for that traditionally present. Only rarely have descendants of the old royalty and aristocracy taken a leading role in the new movement except in the rare instances where individuals have broken away from their traditional status and background.' The national enthusiasm and veneration which might have been accorded to a hereditary monarch is, in Asia, often diverted to other channels, and national political leaders are frequently invested with the attributes of royalty.

Many examples of the veneration, and in some cases deification, of national leaders could be cited. Among the most instructive is the case of Dr Sun Yat-sen. Until recently his portrait could be seen throughout China, on stamps and coins, in restaurants and offices, in private homes and on public monuments. Memorial services were held regularly in government offices, military posts, and public buildings. The service included the singing of the national anthem, the recitation of Dr Sun's Will (which was, in

fact, drafted by Wang Ching-wei who later headed the Japanese puppet regime in China) and three bows before the portrait of Dr Sun and the national flag. This veneration of one who was undoubtedly a very great man is of a kind which the European would associate with the founder of a religion.

Another interesting example is that of the late Mr Jinnah, the first Governor-General of the dominion of Pakistan. Until August 1947 Pakistan was a political theory, and no constitutional entity known as Pakistan existed. India was a unitary State under a central government. Yet on June 8, 1947, Mr M. G. Gazdar, Secretary of the Moslem League in the Sind Assembly, described Mr Jinnah as the 'Shan-en-Shah (King of Kings) of Pakistan.' The next day a crowd of enthusiastic supporters mobbed Mr Jinnah at his hotel and greeted him with shouts of 'Shahgen Shah Pakistan Zindabad'—Long Live the Emperor of Pakistan.

It has been said that in Asia political loyalty is given to personalities rather than programmes, for personal and family loyalty is a deeply ingrained characteristic of Oriental political life, and is closely related to the whole question of the growth of nationalism.

Ernest Renan, in his important essay, 'Qu'est-ce qu'une Nation?' rejects all the factors already mentioned as decisive elements in the development of nationality. 'What constitutes a nation,' he says, 'is not speaking the same tongue or belonging to the same ethnic group, but having accomplished great things in common in the past and the wish to accomplish them in the future.' Renan, in other words, saw the unity of common achievements as an essential element of nationalism, and it matters little from this point of view whether the common achievements are mythical or historical. In Asia, indeed, national traditions are quite often myths, legendary fairy stories.

Many Asian people cherish myths about their divine origin. The Chinese, for instance, have a legend that the Chinese race was founded by the Emperor Huang Ti, the Yellow Emperor, nearly 3,000 B.C. He is credited with the invention of the compass and many other useful things. His wife, Su Ling, was supposed to have been the first to cultivate the mulberry and the silkworm. Whether Huang Ti actually lived or not is uncertain: it is more likely that

the stories which have grown up round his name are, in the words of Tsui Chi, 'the symbolic personification of an era.' Yet this legend is accepted as historical, or at any rate as a useful myth, by many educated Chinese of to-day.

The mythical story of the origin of the Japanese nation, its unique character, and its divine mission, is another illustration of the way that myth can be exploited for nationalist ends.

Closely linked with the existence of traditions and legends (with, of course, the other factors already discussed) is the possession of a common cultural heritage. In the view of some scholars this should be regarded as the basic element in the evolution of nationalism. Its importance is admittedly great, but it cannot be regarded as the sole element since it is never present without others. C. A. Macartney has written: 'In most cases, indeed, the national revival began as a purely cultural movement. . . . The first symptom of the new age was an eager delving into national history and philosophy; the collection of legends and folk-lore, the compilation of grammars and text-books.' It is an almost uniform feature of the national movements in Asia to stress the existence of a unique national culture, and it is often found that the leaders of cultural life play a prominent part in the national movements. Sir S. Radhakrishnan, the Indian philosopher, was recently appointed Ambassador in Moscow.

The system of public examination for entrance into the Chinese Civil Service, with its strong emphasis on the Chinese classics, was an important element in preserving knowledge of Chinese culture, and was, in part, responsible for the traditional association of cultural and political activities. Public servants in China were, by ancient tradition, men of learning, mandarins. Confucius was himself a government official.

In a somewhat different way the *caste* system in India has helped to preserve knowledge of ancient culture and arts. *Caste* is both a racial and an occupational system, and the two elements are not easily distinguished. It is, nevertheless, unquestioned that the passing of traditional skills from father to son within the *caste* prevented the extinction of much that is fine in Indian art and culture. The system of *caste* can, of course, be condemned from many points of view, but in this respect at least it has served a

useful purpose. For a time certain kinds of cultural activity, such as music and dancing, were performed only by people of low *caste*, and it is significant that leaders of the national movement in India have been to the fore in encouraging a more widespread enjoyment of these arts.

It may seem frivolous to regard clothing as an element in nationality, but emphasis on the national dress has been a notable feature of national movements in Asia during recent decades. The so-called Gandhi cap in India was followed by the Jinnah cap in Pakistan. Mr Gandhi and some of his Indian colleagues advocated hand-spinning as a symbol of nationalism, although the practice of hand-spinning was intended also to be a form of self-discipline and a return to a simpler way of living. *Khaddar* (hand-woven material) is worn by Indian patriots for reasons of both sentiment and convenience. European clothing is often regarded as a sign of unnecessary ostentation. A recent Indian Government Notice urges the use of Indian dress on all formal occasions.

There are those who regard nationalism as a state of mind rather than as an ideology moulded by outside factors. This 'will to be a nation' is in some ways the most vital of all the factors we have discussed. Without it nationalism dies ; but it is not enough in itself : it only exists when other elements are present. It is the *élan vital* of nationalism, the product of many other forces, the mental spiritual background which induces people to struggle to transform a political theory into a political fact.

Is nationalism a good or bad ideology ? Should it be encouraged or discouraged ?

There are no simple answers to these questions. The important thing, to my mind, is to see the matter in proportion. We are all citizens of a nation and tend to regard national loyalty as a desirable quality—except in other nations. It is hard to draw a line between a reasonable loyalty to the national ideals and an unreasonable wish to extend those ideals at the expense of others. What we regard as patriotism in ourselves we often regard as exaggerated nationalism in others.

The truth is that nationalism is a stage in political development. The family is superseded by the tribe, the tribe by the nation. And we can expect that the nation

will give place to the regional federation, and finally, perhaps, to a world federal authority. Nationalism is a stage in development, and it only becomes dangerous if we linger too long at that stage. We must not be condescending about those countries which, in enthusiasm for their new-found nationalism, are hesitant about merging their national sovereignty in a larger sovereignty. This reluctance is certainly not confined to Asia.

SYDNEY D. BAILEY.

Art. 8.—ENGLISH ENTERTAINERS IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

1. *The Sports and Pastimes of the People of England.* By Joseph Strutt, 1801 ; a new Edition, much enlarged and corrected by J. Charles Cox, LL.D., F.S.A. Methuen & Co., London, 1903.
2. *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer.* Edited by Alfred W. Pollard and others. Macmillan & Co., Ltd., London, 1904.
3. *The Mediæval Stage.* By E. K. Chambers. Two vols. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1903.
4. *Kemps nine daies wonder &c.* Edited by the Rev. Alexander Dyce. Printed for the Campden Society, 1811.
5. *La Vie Nomade au Moyen Age.* By J. J. Jusserand. Hachette, 1884.

THE chief diversions of pre-Conquest England—horse-racing and the like apart—were harp-playing and singing to harp accompaniment. After supper this instrument would be passed from hand to hand, when the company would either sing verses which they had previously committed to memory or improvise. That such exercises called for considerable skill is obvious, even had we not the account which the Venerable Bede gives us of Caedmon, a servant of the monastery of Whitby who died about A.D. 680. He was uninstructed compared with his fellows, had learned no poetry by heart, and when it was approaching his turn to play and sing he would steal from the hall in confusion. One night it fell to him to keep watch over the stables ; for there were wolves still in England, and in the deep heart of the forest, bears. Anticipating the harp's approach, he fled in his usual manner, flung himself down upon the ground, and wept until, exhausted by grief, he fell into a profound slumber. Straightway an Angel appeared before him, who saluting him by name, cried :

'Caedmon, sing me something !'

Yet sunk in slumber, Caedmon made answer : 'I know of nothing to sing ; for my incapacity in this respect was the cause of my leaving the hall to come hither.'

'Nay,' said the Angel, 'thou hast something to sing.'

'What must I sing ?'

'Sing the Creation.'

And straightway the sleeper began to sing verses which he had never heard before. When fully awake he found not only that he could recall those verses which he had improvised whilst sleeping, but that he could add others to them. He told the Bailiff of Whitby what had befallen him, and the Bailiff conducted him to the Abbess Hilda. This lady convoked the learned men who, by way of trial, expounded in English certain passages from the Scriptures, requesting Caedmon to return to that place upon the morning following, and recite in verse what they had read in prose. This Caedmon did, declaiming upon the morrow a poem of surpassing loveliness. And thereupon the listening monks were confirmed in their opinion that his was no lying vision, but that Caedmon's song was the authentic gift of Heaven. Those, and they are not a few, who represent the English of the centuries immediately preceding the Conquest as drunken boors, should meditate on this gracious legend with all its implications. (One passage from Caedmon is believed to have inspired Milton's description of the despairing Satan, in Book IV of 'Paradise Lost.') Caedmon died A.D. 735. Alfric, Archbishop of Canterbury—died 1006—compiled a Latin grammar, and his devotion to the tongue of Cicero earned for him the nickname of 'The Grammarian.' King Alfred bore constantly upon his person and *translated* the 'De Consolatione' of the Stoic philosopher Boethius. Could William the Norman have done as much?

King Alfred must have been a proficient upon the harp, or he would hardly have risked detection when, disguised as a musician by profession, and acting the part of his own intelligence officer, he penetrated the camp of Guthrum the Dane and sang him out of his military secrets. The knowledge thus acquired he put to use later when, at the battle of Eddington in Wiltshire, he routed the invaders with terrific slaughter. He had run fearful risks. Had these savages seen through his disguise, they might well have treated him as they did the East Anglian King Edmund—interred at 'Edmundsbury'—whom, when their prisoner of war, they first beat with clubs, then lashed whilst still living to a tree, as a target for their archers.

The old English entertainers were distinguished by two appellations, gleemen—from *gleam*: revelry or joy—and

harpers. Although, as their name implies, the latter specialised upon the harp, most of them appear to have played also the *vielle*—a primitive fiddle—the pipe, trumpet, tabor, and horn. The gleemen, for their part, excelled rather as dancers, tumblers, and sleight-of-hand practitioners. An illumination in a MS. of the Cotton Library, British Museum (Vespasian A.1), shows us two gleemen performing. The one sends aloft three balls and three open-bladed knives in rotation whilst his fellow accompanies him with music; possibly upon the *vielle*. The more austere churchmen denounced the entertainers vehemently, frequently, and ineffectively. When books were few, and there were few to read them, it was not in human nature to turn away from the door that music and poetry which travelled by the roads, lulled care asleep and replaced it by merriment. Besides, the more genial churchmen encouraged these fellows.

The Normans were not a whit less given to the mirth-makers' performances than were the native English. The minstrel Taillefer appeared at the head of William's army singing of Charlemagne and Roland. Then approaching Harold's levies on horseback, he threw his spear three times into the air and caught it as often. The fourth time he threw it amongst his adversaries, wounding one of them. It is with satisfaction one records that this bellicose merry-andrew with his ill-timed japes made his last public appearance at Hastings.

The harpers and gleemen of the earlier days continued their performances under the newly acquired names of minstrels and jongleurs. They sang at Court and in the castle hall, in taverns and at the cross-roads, and the Normans were neither blind to their power as satirists nor their value as propagandists. Roger Hoveden the Chronicler—(?) 1117–1200—informs us that William Longchamp, Bishop of Ely, who held under Richard Coeur de Lion the offices of Chancellor, Justiciary (or Lord Chief Justice) and Papal Legate, both maintained a number of English minstrels in regular pay and by means of rich gifts, lured many more over from the Continent, that they might sing in the public streets *de illo*, that is concerning himself, declaring everywhere that *non erat talis in orbe*, there was not his equal in the world! This was the mediæval equivalent of 'keeping in with the press.'

Horace in a famous Ode speaks of those heroes who, living before the days of Agamemnon, were the unhappy inheritors of oblivion and eternal night, because there was no sacred poet to sing their praises. It was hard upon King Richard's Lord Chief Justice that, after spending a fortune upon poets, he should share at last the same black night with those primitive men. What went wrong? He ran no risks. He was a magnet to poets. Perhaps the verse was at fault? Perhaps his poets did not find William inspiring?

Whether true or not, the tradition concerning Blondel and King Richard shows that minstrels could at times be the intimates of royalty. Learning that his master had crossed the sea upon his return from the Crusade out of Syria, Blondel, Richard's favourite minstrel, assumed that he must have been taken prisoner by his enemies. He accordingly set out in quest of him. After much fruitless wandering, he arrived in a small town where there was a castle belonging to the Duke of Austria. Mingling with the crowd, he learned that there was a prisoner within its walls who had been confined there above a year; but he could neither come to the sight of him nor ascertain any particulars as to his quality. He therefore devised a stratagem. He discovered by inquiry that the stranger was immured in a certain tower, contrived to station himself beneath one of its windows, and there played and sang the first part of a song which Richard and he had composed in collaboration. Hearing the first part of the song, Richard immediately sang the concluding verses from within the walls. Blondel recognised his master's voice and knew that he had achieved his quest. Hastening back to England, he told the Barons the result of his search and they, raising a prodigious sum by way of ransom, paid it over to the Duke and brought the captive home.

Of what did the minstrels sing when not belauding William or redeeming Richard?

‘Of Alexandre the conqueroure,
Of Julius Cesar the emperoure,
Of Grece and Troy the strong stryf
Ther many a man lost his lyf.’

And yet our new school of internationalists would persuade us that there is no such thing as the European tradition!

The scope of the minstrels embraced tales 'both of wepyng and of game.' Chaucer furnishes us with samples of both. The Miller's tale is exceedingly gamesome, whilst that of the Monk belongs so completely to the 'wepying' variety that, as Master of Ceremonies, mine Host of the 'Tabard' exclaims :

'Sire Monk, namoore of this, so God you blesse !
 Youre tale anyeth all this compaignye ;
 Swich talkyng is nat worth a boterflye !'

The 'gestiours'—not jesters but reciters of 'gestes' or romances of adventure—also laid the traditions concerning King Arthur and his Knights under heavy contribution. One of these last, the North Country alliterative romance of 'Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight,' the original of which we know to have been publicly recited, is still extant and is admittedly a masterpiece.

And to what instruments did the minstrels play ? A few have been added since the days of Alfred, and their names breathe the fragrance of old time ; possess something of the evocative power of poetry : rebec, shalm, sackbut, doucet, horn ; the rota, vieille, gittern, clarion, and psaltery ; the syrinx or pan-pipes ; the regal or portable organ. From the capitals of the lofty pillars of our cathedrals ; from the bosses at the intersecting groins of their ceilings, and in their dusky crypts, it is to such instruments that sculptured angels sing praises which are only to be heard by the Eternal Father. To these we may add two more, both to be found in Chaucer, the cornemuse or bagpipes :

'And pipés made of grené corne,
 As han these litel herdé-groomes,
 That kepen bestés in the broomes.'

But perhaps in these sunshiny lines the Poet's thoughts have strayed from Plantagenet England to Vergil's Arcadia.

The minstrels possess a keen eye to the main chance. When entertaining the rich they seldom fail to make liberality towards members of their own profession, an outstanding virtue of the hero of romance whom they chance to be celebrating.

'Ipomydon gaff [gave] in that stound, [place]
 To mynstrellés five hundred pound.'

One can imagine the old baron exchanging anxious glances with his wife when, musically and *meaningly*, the entertainers enunciated this passage. In a curious fugitive piece, 'London Lyckpenny,' Lydgate gives a vivid thumb-nail sketch in which we see, amongst other things, a tavern of Old London with minstrels singing.

'Then to Westminster gate I presently went,
When the sun was at high prime :
Cooks to me they took good intent,
And proffered me bread, with ale and wine,
Ribs of beef, both fat and full fine ;
A fair cloth they gan for to spread,
But wanting money, I might not be sped. . . .

Then I hied me unto East-Cheap,
One cries ribs of beef, and many a pie ;
Pewter pots they clattered on a heap ;
There was harp, pipe, and minstrelsy ;
Yea by cock ! nay by cock ! some began cry ;
Some sung of Jenkin and Julian for their meed ; [money]
But, for lack of money, I might not speed.'

Every stanza of this piece concludes with the Poet's complaint that he cannot purchase this or the other object—hood, hat, spectacles, or indeed a square meal—for lack of money ; nor should we think him querulous. For though poetry brings in good dividends, the time factor is against the investor, so that it is his descendants who draw them after his death. Could Lydgate but have received a single halfpenny from every curious reader who, since his time, has dipped into his works, he might have purchased all those objects of which he stood in need, and then have sat down happily to the beef, bread, wine, and the minstrels' song.

The invention of printing was to lower the prestige of the singers, for it made their public independent of the spoken word. Two proverbs recall the heyday of the craft. 'The ape pays with gambols'—that is, 'We'll ask him to the party : he won't contribute, but he'll make us all laugh'—and 'I got it for a song.' For the man with the performing animal might pass a gate without paying toll, simply by making the creature perform. Minstrels in like fashion paid toll with a ditty.

With Chaucer a new word comes into the language, the variously spelt 'tregetour,' or conjuror. The gleemen and

gleemaidens of pre-Conquest England had often combined sleight-of-hand tricks with singing, but the 'tregetours' of the new school were veritable Maskelynes and Devants. Even by men of high intelligence they were believed to perform some at least of their illusions by natural magic, that is, by a knowledge of the powers of Nature, and an ability to control these powers, which were not possessed by the ordinary man. But we must bear in mind that the sceptical scientific type of mind hardly came into being before the Renaissance.

'Ther saw I Coll Tregetour,
Upon a table of sicamour
Pley an uncouth thyng to telle;
I saw him carien [carry] a wynd-melle
Under a walsh-note [walnut] shale.'

I could wish that Chaucer, usually crystal-clear, had been more explicit in this one passage. Obviously a windmill small enough to be packed into a walnut shell could be carried by a mouse. What then exactly happened? Was the windmill a huge machine, and did the walnut expand to cover it?

The 'table' in any case was clearly a stage, and as such would admit of trap-doors. The tregetours travelled in companies; we may therefore assume confederates. And we must bear in mind that they performed their illusions by artificial light, and that none of the best. And the illusionists were doubtless very well aware of the power of mass suggestion and thoroughly understood the art of exploiting it. Elsewhere Chaucer speaks of their 'fumygaciouns.' Readers of Benvenuto Cellini's memoirs will recall that astounding scene in the Forum at Rome when, at midnight, the necromancer raises the devils. The circle is traced with impressive ceremonies, and Chaucer's 'fumygaciouns' are brought into use, *profummi preziosi . . . e . . . cattivi*: combustibles which threw off some agreeable, others fetid odours. The spectators were probably drugged by breathing these exhalations; but whether or no, against a background of thick ever-shifting smoke, extraordinary effects may be produced by means of a concealed magic lantern; and this apparatus it is now believed the mediæval conjurors possessed, jealously guarding the secret, of course, from those who were not of

their craft. Chaucer's description of the illusionists and their tricks, as put into the mouth of Aurelius in the Franklin's tale, makes curious reading.

' For I am siker [sure] that ther be sciénces
By whiche men maken diverse apparence,
Swiche as thise subtile tregetourés pleye.
For ofte at feestés have I wel herd seye
That tregetours withinne an hallé large
Have maad come in a water and a barge,
And in the hallé rowen up and down.
Somtyme hath seméd come a grim leoun,
And somtyme flourés spryng as in a meed ;
Somtyme a vyne, and grapés white and rede,
Somtyme a castel, al of lym [lime] and stoon,
And when hem lykéd voyded it anoon, [caused it
suddenly to vanish]
Thus seméd it to every mannés sighte.'

It goes without saying that the poor tregetours were anathema to the 'unco' guid'; the author of 'Antecrist' of (?) 1380 speaks scathingly of

' Tregetours & tombleres, with gestiours & japeres,'

but no one listened. The account rolls of Durham Abbey for the fourteenth century contain many references to harpers. In 1362 we find a harper belonging to the Bishop of Norwich visiting the Abbey at the feast of the translation of St Cuthbert when he received five shillings. This man was a '*historio* harper,' that is he combined music with jesting. What can reformers do with men who *will* laugh?

Henry V, the hero of Agincourt, maintained a court tregetour, to fleet the hour with his semi-witchcrafts which gilded the flying hours and harmed no one. In his 'Daunce of Machabree'—or 'Dance of Death'—Lydgate makes the King of Terrors address the Illusionist and the latter reply.

' Maister John Rykell, sometime tregetour
Of noble Henry kinge of Eng[el]londe,
And of France the mighty conqueror ;
For all the sleightes, and turnyng of thine honde,
Thou must come nere this dance, I understonde ;
Naught may avail all thy conclusions,
For Dethe shortly, nother on see nor land,
Is not desceyved by no illusions.'

And John Rykell answers :

'What may availe mankyndé naturale ?
 Not any craft (?) schevid by apparence,
 Or course of steres above celestial,
 Or of heavens all the influence,
 Ageynest Deth to stonde at defence.
 Lygarde-de-mayne now helpith me right noughte ;
 Farewell, my craft and all such sapience ;
 For Deth hath mo masteries than I have wroughte.' *

But time flies and we must say farewell to the tregetours, bringing their grim but innocuous lions in amongst the ladies after dinner ; conveying water and shipping into the great hall without making it inconveniently damp ; causing stone-built castles to vanish at a nod of the head ; or merely walking around with windmills packed, for greater security, in walnut shells. Disgruntled satirists might gibe at

'Trygetours & triflours that taverns haunte.'

But no trifter performed feats like these. Master John Rykell 'walked with kings,' but he was not so bourgeois as to keep 'the common touch.'

Professional dancers of many types helped to while away the odd hours between supper and bed, whilst the logs roared upon the great hearths, the knights and ladies of old time looked down from the tapestries, and taper or flaring torch brought eyes of light into the silver cans and goblets above the salt. Chaucer has many names for the dancers of his day. Some he calls *tymbesteres*: the timbrel or tambourine players. These whilst they were dancing would fling up, catch, and hold upon the point of a finger the spinning timbrel. Others again he terms *saillouris*—Latin *salire* to bound—do we not still call an undistinguished dance a 'hop ?'

'Thér was many a tymbester,
 And saillouris that I dar wel swere
 Couth [understood] her craft ful parfitly ;
 The tymbers [timbrels] up ful sotilly,
 They caste and hente [caught] full ofte
 Upon a fynger faire and softe,
 That they ne failide [failed] never mo.'

* Harl. MS. No. 116, quoted by Strutt. A slightly different version is reprinted in William Dugdale's folio 'History of St Paul's Cathedral,' London, 1658.

And the Poet speaks of damsels dancing in 'kirtles and none other wede': in light jackets, that is, only; both for greater ease whilst dancing and to display grace of limb. Another of Chaucer's words is *tombesteres*, which has its counterpart in low-Latin *tombare*, to tumble. Tumbling would appear to have been an essential element of the art of our English Pavlovas from the earliest times. We need but look at the gargoyles of our ancient churches to realise that our ancestors had a relish for the grotesque which the more critical study of the Classics at the Renaissance helped to put out of fashion. In a seventh-century translation of the Gospels the daughter of Herodias 'jumps' to please Herod. In another of the eleventh she 'tumbled and it pleased Herod.' And in the stained glass of Lincoln Cathedral she appears standing upon her head, and touching with red-stockinged feet the upper line of the panel. A MS. of the ninth century shows us a woman dancing before an infuriated bear whose master holds it roped by the collar, and further torments it with a switch. Denied by Nature any taste for the poetry of motion, the frustrated creature betrays an understandable desire to tear the young lady in pieces, and if possible, make a meal of her afterwards. Well, we must not be too critical. The actress who puts her head in the lion's mouth still enchants a certain section of the modern music-hall audience.

It is generally agreed that Morris dance is a corruption of 'Moorish' dance; that it was introduced into Spain from Africa, and thence into England by the followers of Eleanor of Castile, to whom Edward I was betrothed at the age of ten and whom he married when he was fifteen. The *mariage de convenance* was a complete success, the lady following her husband to the Crusade in 1269 and saving his life by sucking the poison from a wound which had been inflicted on him by a Saracen with a poisoned dagger. This by the way. The Morris dance achieved immediate popularity, and so early as the reign of Henry V had become an integral part of the May Day revels. By this time the original dance had probably undergone extensive modifications, for the dancers now dressed to represent Robin Hood and his merry companions, Much the Miller's Son, Scarlet, Little John, Friar Tuck, and of course Maid Marian. There was also a Foreman of the Morris in gala cloak and doublet, the hobby-horse, and the dragon. It

is to be presumed that the bells attached to the performers' costumes were not intended solely to jingle in time with the rhythm, but to play simple tunes, for they were not of a size. They were termed the 'fore bell,' 'second bell,' the 'treble' or 'great bell,' whilst 'double-bells' are also mentioned.

Although he lived in Elizabeth's reign, one can hardly omit the name of William Kemp if one is to speak of the the Morris. He was a Shakespearian actor who, amongst other parts, played Dogberry in 'Much Ado' and Justice Shallow in 'Henry IV.' But the feat by which he is remembered to-day is his dancing the Morris the whole way from London to Norwich. He broke off at intervals to rest; but he covered every foot of the way. Kemp danced through Whitechapel amid shouts of 'God-speed!' He entered Bury like a Roman emperor upon a triumph whilst—unheeded as a ghost at noontide—the Lord Chief Justice of England was percolating through into that city by another gate.

Our morris dancer was given an astonishing welcome. The City Waits played in his honour; and they possessed some of the best boy-singers in England. He met with hospitality upon all sides, more especially from the Mayor and Aldermen, the former even making him a freeman of his own company, the Merchant Venturers. They paid the expenses of travel incurred by him, his umpire, and his taborer, and gave him a purse out of hand containing five pounds in Elizabethan angels. So farewell Kemp, Prince of Morris Dancers! If you have drawn me into a digression, how many thousands of others did you not divert from their more ordinary avocations to witness your skipping progress from London to Norwich.

Of all the spectacles which our forebears of the Middle Age enjoyed, none surpassed for magnificence that of the tournament. The gaily plumed knights were cased from head to foot in shining steel. The heads and chests of their horses were likewise armoured, and their footcloths were of the richest materials, of cloth-of-silver and of gold. Heralds in their gay tabards sounded fanfares; whilst the special gallery, where sat the Queen of Beauty and her retinue, constituted a spectacle in itself. 'To tell you the apparel of the ladies, their rich attyres, their sumptuous luells [jewels] . . . their diuersities of beauties . . . I

assure you ten *mennes wittes* can scarce [scarce] declare it.' And the element of danger which casts so fearful a spell over the human imagination was ever present. The first of the Earls of Salisbury, of the name of Montague, died of injuries received at a tournament; his grandson, Sir William Montague, was at this sport killed by his own father. These are oft-quoted cases. What is not generally known is that Henry VIII narrowly missed his death at a jousting. His opponent, the Duke of Suffolk, wore a defective helmet the eye-slit of which was not squarely opposite his eyes.

'Sir,' his gentleman tells him, 'the king is come to the tyltis ende.'

'I see him not on my fayth, for my head piece taketh from me my sight.'

The King meanwhile—it seemed in some momentary fit of distraction—had failed to lower his visor.

'Sir,' says the Duke's gentleman, 'now the kyng cometh!' Lance in rest, the blinded Duke set forward at the gallop, the King thundered to meet him, and the terrified spectators, perceiving the King's danger, shouted '*Hold! Hold!*' The Duke's spear struck just above the King's bare brow, going all to shivers and filling his helmet with splinters. Despite this excruciating experience, King Henry ran six more courses that day. His bearing, his outstanding courage, his almost aggressive self-confidence, made him the idol of the multitude. He may have been ten times a scoundrel: but he was a *king*.

Although the *ludi* and *spectacula* of the Romans continued in favour for above two centuries after the introduction of Christianity, the moment the Church won power, her attitude towards players was one of uncompromising hostility. The vesting of supreme power in the Emperors, by reducing the aristocrats to impotence, had created what was, in effect, a democracy, and this turned from the art of the theatre which it could not understand to sensation in its vilest forms; to gladiatorial shows and public executions. But it is by no means impossible that, here and there, some piece of merit *may* have been suppressed together with those *spectacula* which were merely revolting.

For the militant ascetic is a perennial type. Given the opportunity, Savonarolla would have burned Botticelli's '*Venus*'; the Puritans would have flogged Shakespeare;

and Bossuet—even he!—is credited with having declared of the first comic genius of France, 'Molière est un infame histrion': an infamous mountebank.

But there is something in the temperament of the West which demands an art that is full of movement, and this urge it is impossible indefinitely to suppress. The Church compromised. So early as the days of Ethelred the Unready we find a dialogue for use at the Dedication Festival in Winchester Cathedral. The Angel at the Tomb demands of the Holy Women what they seek? They inform him, and he announces the Resurrection. The piece concludes with a couplet in rhyming Latin which bears this stage-direction: '*Mulieri canant una voce jubilantes*': Let the women sing, as though with one voice, rejoicingly.

The extreme popularity of the liturgical drama led to a migration from church to churchyard, that more spectators might be accommodated. Further developments were the 'Mysteries'—which deal with scriptural incidents—the 'Miracles'—dramatic versions of the legends which had grown up around the saints—and the 'Moralities' in which the players presented such abstractions as Charity, Youth or Hope. From extant records we are familiar with the type of theatre upon whose boards such themes were presented. Thus at Chester the playhouse consisted of: 'A highe place made like a howse with ij rowms, being open on ye tope: the lower rowme they apparelled and dressed them selves; and in the higher rowme they played; and they stood upon . . . wheeles.' The lower of the two rooms was curtained off; the upper open on all four sides. The whole theatre could be dragged by oxen or horses so that one act of such a play as that of the 'Creation' could be presented in one quarter of the City; another in another.

Particulars of some of the mediæval properties have come down to us. At Canterbury, for instance, the steeds of the Magi were made of laths, hoops, and painted canvas. As to ride a creature of this type would have been courting a fall, presumably it would be led by a page. The craft guilds now took a main hand in such productions, and with a quaint sense of what was befitting we find that, at York and Newcastle, a scene in which Noah figured was presented by the Shipwrights; at Beverley, Newcastle, and York, the Magi were played by the Goldsmiths; whilst at

Chester the 'Coronation of the Virgin' was enacted by the 'worshipfull wyves of this town.' These crafts guilds were opulent companies; they willingly incurred expense and exercised much ingenuity in heightening their effects. They presented St George and the Dragon 'very lively to behold,' the Devil 'very boisterous,' and savages of the Dragon's country with 'huge black shaggie hayre.'

Chaucer's Parish Clerk, Absolom, could turn player upon occasion. Something, let us admit it, of a *lady-killer*, he arranged his fan-shaped beard and combed his yellow curls to the best advantage. He wore decorated shoes and red stockings. He could 'trip and daunce' upon a feast-day, and sing love-songs which he would himself accompany upon fiddle or gittern. And

'Somtyme to shew his lightnesse and maistrye,
He pleyeth Heródés, on a scaffold high.'

And yet with all these gifts one doubts his ecclesiastical superiors marking him down for promotion; one would think it odd if he rose to be a bishop.

Although it would be stretching the meaning of the word to describe Chaucer himself as an *entertainer*, yet I have drawn so liberally upon him in the course of this sketch that I feel I should be ungrateful were I to exclude him altogether from their ranks. How much delight has he given, and to how many thousands of readers, in the six centuries of time which have elapsed since his penning of the 'Canterbury Tales'! In the national bederoll of our great poets we must rank him, as a humanist, immediately after Shakespeare. Milton indeed is sublime, but his characters are superhuman, and his scenes are set in Heaven, Hell, or Paradise; not on the London-Canterbury road.

And what a quick journalist's eye this Chaucer possessed! Observing his abstracted air, the Host cries, chaffing him:

'What man artow?;
Thou lookest as thou wouldest fynde an hare;
For ever upon the ground I se thee stare.'

How was mine Host to divine that Chaucer's seeming absentmindedness was but a cloak by means of which he could the better observe his fellow pilgrims, by first putting

them off their guard? How astonished Harry Bailey would have been to learn that he was being *interviewed*.

And with what quick laughing magic will Chaucer bring a character to life by one stroke of the pen!

'With many a tempest had his berd been shake;'

and the Shipman stands before us. How observant is our poet of tricks and mannerisms! How quick to assess a point of view! With what fine irony he sums up what he imagines to be the philosophy of the Friar with regard to his penitents!

'For many a man so harde is of his herte
He may not wepe al though hym souré smerte,
Therefore in stede of wepyng and preyéres
Men moote yeve silver to the pouré freres.'

And the Prioress, do we not know her, with her trick of smiling coyly, her English accent in French, her exquisite table manners, and that gentle heart which made her

'Wepe if that she saugh a mous
Kaught in a trappe, if it were dede or bledde.'

If Chaucer's King Richard II ever occupies our thoughts, it is by virtue of Shakespeare's verse. Chaucer exists in his own right. All those other entertainers, the harpers, the players upon gittern and vielle, the minstrels with their high-flown romances, the tumblers and the tregetours we can know only through research; but Chaucer expresses himself in poems as fresh and dewy as his own moon-daisy in May, that month whose evanescent loveliness no other poet ever captured with more sure enchantment.

KENNETH HARE.

Art. 9.—DISRAELI AND THE TWO NATIONS.

ONE hundred years ago, when this country must have appeared as the greatest and most national of the nation-states, Disraeli startled his compatriots by saying that England was not one nation but two: the rich and the poor. But the division is not confined to nineteenth-century England: it is universal, and has existed from the beginning of human society. Nor is it confined to rich and poor. Riches and poverty are symptoms of a deeper division which could survive, and in part has survived them: the division of rulers and ruled. How does this division come about, and how is it perpetuated?

There are two broad explanations, which we may call the psychological and the economic. Psychologically, the division in society is caused by power and indolence: the positive egoism of power in the rulers, the negative egoism of indolence in the ruled. The few whose will to power is strong enough, seize, or gain gradually, the power of wealth, land, and positions of state (partly, of course, so that they may also indulge their indolence by making others work for them): the many whose indolence prefers slavery to initiative, allow the few to seize power and perpetuate it. The longer it is perpetuated, the harder it is to revolt; but however difficult, changes in society can always be brought about if the people will it. Unfortunately the revolutionary leaders usually betray the people, and themselves succumb to the lure of power, as in the French and Russian revolutions. Whatever form the two nations may take—rich and poor, aristocrats and plebeians, bureaucrats and proletarians, intellectuals and mob, these forces are at work.

The economic explanation, popularised by Marx, is that not individuals but the forces of nature and economic exchange, demand and supply, bring about the division of society. The Marxists believe that in primitive times long periods of hunger and want drove men to seize, by any means, what they could. In the struggle, those lucky enough to grab the most became the masters and doled out to the others who worked for them. This division dialectically unfolded through the ages, giving rise to various economic stages: slavery, feudalism, capitalism,

communism. Obviously there is some truth in this explanation. Economic forces do play an important part, and Marxism has been useful in emphasising them. But without power and indolence, over and above mere material need, the division could never have come about or been perpetuated. There is no reason to believe in widespread hunger in primitive man any more than in animals who, except in specific cases such as the ants and bees, and on rare occasions, have never divided into 'two nations.' And even if such a division had arisen in primitive society, there is no reason, on economic grounds, why it should have been *perpetuated*. Primitive needs and economic exchange do not account for the seizure of great tracts of land and wealth, and the setting up of strongholds and castles, by groups of men who already possessed sufficient wealth to live in ease and comfort: they do not account for the officer under William the Conqueror becoming a baron, and his descendants trying to seize the throne, any more than they account for Mr Jones of suburbia driving ruthlessly forward to become a company director. Nor do they account for the millions who will work all their lives in dirty surroundings for bad wages and not raise a finger to help themselves. The deeper causes of human egoism are needed to explain the permanence of the two nations.

This question is: if the egoistic states of power and indolence are endemic to human nature, can the division they produce ever be healed? There is no final answer; but if we recognise these psychological conditions for what they are we may do much to heal the division and make the two nations one. If, however, we persist in attempting to reduce it solely to economic terms, it will inevitably be worsened. Disraeli, though he did not overlook the importance of objective and economic forces, saw very clearly that the division is psychological; hence the will to power must be canalised in a free and varied social structure, and indolence must be met by opportunity.

This attitude partly derived from Disraeli's own temperament, personality, and character. He was all of a piece in that his character and the quality of his thought were intimately related, a thing unusual in famous men whose lives are frequently as disordered and stupid as their work is formal and creative. He was a sensitive

humanist of profound psychological acumen : a man of insight and vision : a unique personality, fascinating, extraordinary, and certainly one of the strangest human beings who have ever lived. The elusiveness and charm of his character were felt by all who came in contact with him. There is nothing stranger than Disraeli in his own novels at their most fantastic.

The unity of his character and thought was such that he experienced and lived just those feelings of power and indolence, together with a genuine idealism, that he depicted in his novels. In his youth he desired and pursued power ; but we must not, for this reason, regard him, as some have done, as a complete egoist. There was a great deal of egoism in him at all times ; but his sense of humour saw through it, and his sense of cosmic awe and of the triviality of human ambition held its worst aspects in check. His love of power had about it something objective, like a love of the sublime in nature, art, and architecture. He desired power less for the gratification of his own ego than for the ability to carry out his dreams of reform : he desired wealth for the full life it enabled him to lead : he courted the friendship of the great because he genuinely liked their company. Whatever arrogance or egoistic ambition he possessed was balanced by a profound capacity for friendship and, in a few cases, real devotion. He had many friends and few lasting enemies : most people came round to him in the end ; even Gladstone, grudgingly. His devotion to his sister and his wife, and, in a different way, to his sovereign was remarkable. No real egoist could have loved as Disraeli loved Mary Ann : the marriage was idyllic. This power of affection and of inspiring affection is the mark of a certain fundamental goodness in a man, whatever surface faults he may possess. Also, as George Sampson points out, he was much more sincere and courageous than is sometimes believed : we ' must beware of supposing . . . that self-consciousness is another name for insincerity. Few people suspected the indomitable courage and inexorable tenacity of the insolent, over-dressed dandy. . . . ' Yet with all this Disraeli felt the drag of indolence which enabled him to understand the vice which is peculiar to the masses in spite of all their suffering and heroism.

To these gifts of temperament and character he added

a wide knowledge and sense of history, partly derived from the influence of his father, an omnivorous reader who spent the greater part of his life in his library. Isaac D'Israeli read a great deal of history, and was an authority on the Stuarts. He was pro-Stuart, as was his son—and indeed one usually finds that those who regard society humanistically are pro-Stuart while those who regard it scientifically are anti-Stuart. The former see the Stuarts as sensitive men of culture attacked by the cunning and greed of power-intoxicated fanatics: the latter see them as weak pawns in the play of economic forces.

Disraeli's historical and political outlook was distinguished by breadth of vision, realism of approach, humanity, subtlety, and sanity—the last two a rare combination. He felt the pulse of England with a more sensitive touch than almost any man of his day; and it is one of the greatest paradoxes of his life that a Jew of exotic, oriental appearance, should have been not only devoted to England, her history, traditions, people, and land, but have so miraculously experienced England in his bones. The inherited Jewish tradition made him a cosmopolitan who could understand world affairs: his English birth, environment, and upbringing made him a patriot who understood England better than the ancient families who governed her.

Disraeli, unique in himself and in so many things, was certainly unique in being a really good novelist with an established reputation, and at the same time a distinguished politician and Prime Minister. His early training as a writer enabled him to express his mature political views in fictional form, and thus to reach a wider and more varied audience than any Prime Minister before and few since. The best of his work combines the imaginative and the didactic. He was one of the earliest of the literary prophets who have so flourished in this century, many to the detriment of literature and the debasement of philosophy, a few, such as Shaw, Chesterton, Aldous Huxley, to their glory. As a novelist, Disraeli is, as we should expect from the man, consistently interesting. The play of his extraordinary mind is always stimulating and attractive, even when the actual writing is commonplace or melodramatic. The ingredients of interest in his novels are many: the light they reveal of his own character and shed on his own

times ; the historical background ; the contrast of aristocracy and wealth with poverty ; psychology, travel, colour and pageantry, imagination, and vivid description. His life and books were one, because his life was, in the truest sense, a work of art.

' Sybil, or The Two Nations ' is not only one of Disraeli's best and best-known novels : it reveals the best qualities of his personality and thought. Politically it is not so much an analysis of social ills as an indictment ; not so much a plan or theory for improvement as an ideal. The method of detached analysis, the study of events and their causes, classification and statistics, as typified in the work of Marx and the Webbs, was foreign to Disraeli : he was vividly aware of what was wrong, and he communicated that awareness to the reader through the medium of fiction. He offers no blue-print for Utopia, but is content to allow his ideals to emerge in the speeches of his characters, and develop in the events of his plot. His aim was a renewed conservatism, informed by vision and sensibility. He believed in a vital monarchy standing for the people and checking the will to power of aristocrats and bureaucrats who would, nevertheless, balance the crown, and give a lead to the nation ; in a new and vital constitution including the best in economic and industrial advance, and incorporating many features of Catholic medievalism—guild, craft, and so on. He believed in a living Church for the people, not a mere state machine. In Sampson's words, ' the Crown must govern, the Church must inspire, the Aristocracy must lead, the Commons must construct.'

Before passing to the teaching of ' Sybil,' the book is worth considering on its merits as fiction. The plot is rather loosely constructed in the Disraelian manner, and serves mainly as a background for the message, the delineation of character, and the description of events. Sybil Gerard and her father Walter, an enlightened worker, though poor in station are in fact descended from a great family whose titles have lapsed and have passed over, through legal jugglery, to the great house of Mowbray. They are Catholics, firm in devotion to the old Faith which, for them, stands for England (as it did for such typical Englishmen as Newman, Chesterton, Elgar). Young Lord Egremont accidentally meets Sybil, her father, and Stephen Morley, a rather fanatical type of reformer, on his

own estate, and is inspired by their conversation. They do not know who he is. Later, after a quarrel with his brother Lord Marney, he goes to live near them under an assumed name. He falls in love with Sybil and is gradually converted to her father's outlook. Hatton, a pedigree expert, betrays the Mowbray secret. An angry mob march on the house and destroy it, among them Stephen Morley, also in love with Sybil, who is killed. Sybil and Egremont are united. Within this slender framework are many sub-plots and developments, all concerned with the contrasted doings of the 'two nations,' the aristocratic ruling class and the poor and dispossessed. The best writing in the book is in the essayish passages which reveal Disraeli's flow of language, clarity of thought, irony, and wit. The syntax is often peculiar and sometimes awkward; but the style, though not 'literary' is adequate. The book is weakest in situation, and with one or two exceptions, in characterisation—the exceptions being people based upon elements in Disraeli's own character. He is fond of introducing into his novels political contemporaries known to him, which gives a very personal, urgent, and authentic quality to much of his writing. Though few of the characters live, the psychology is generally sound, revealing a shrewd grasp of human nature, and his choice of names is piquant and clever. 'Sybil' is intensely readable and holds the interest. It is not a great work, simply as fiction; but it has greatness in so far as it is part of Disraeli's great personality.

Some of the best examples of Disraelian irony are in the chapters on the rise of titled families—rather unfair, perhaps, since these families played a big part in helping him in his career, and entertained him lavishly. But it all is extremely amusing and very largely true. Disraeli also excels in passages of inconsequential wit. 'No matter, whatever may be the cause, one too often drives away from a country house rather hipped. The specific would be immediately to drive to another, and it is a favourite remedy.' It reminds one of Wilde, who may have been influenced by Disraeli. In his more direct and obvious humour Disraeli can be no less delightful, as in the description of Sir Vavasour's attempt to get the status of the baronetage raised.

"And such a body!" exclaimed Sir Vavasour, with animation. "Picture us for a moment, to yourself, going down in procession to Westminster, for example, to hold a chapter. Five or six hundred baronets in dark green costume—the appropriate dress of *equites aurati*; each not only with his badge, but with his collar of SS; belted and scarfed; his star glittering; his pennon flying; his hat white, with a plume of white feathers; of course the sword and the gilt spurs. In one hand, the thumb-ring and signet not forgotten, we hold our coronet of two balls! . . . We should be accompanied by an equal number of gallant knights, our elder sons, who, the moment they come of age, have the right to claim knighthood of their sovereign, while their mothers and wives, no longer degraded to the nomenclature of a sheriff's lady, but resuming their legal and analogical dignities, and styled 'the honorable baronetess' with her coronet and robe, or the 'honorable knightess' with her golden collar of SS, and chaplet or cap of dignity, may either accompany the procession, or, ranged in galleries in a becoming situation, rain influence from above."

Disraeli's power of description, though not one of his greatest gifts, is often effective. He is best in the intimate scene, which he describes without strain or rhetoric. He was sensitive to nature, and some of his descriptions of scenery were peculiarly vivid, as in the passage on Gerard's garden by moonlight, with its 'apples that rivalled rubies; pears of topaz tint; a whole paraphernalia of plums, some purple as the amethyst, others blue and brilliant as the sapphire; an emerald here, and now a golden drop that gleamed like the yellow diamond of Gengis Khan.' But on a large canvas his descriptive powers failed—for example, his description of the Black Country which we may compare with that of Dickens in 'The Old Curiosity Shop.' Disraeli's writing is flat beside the wonderful imaginative writing of Dickens. Disraeli reconstructed what he had seen: Dickens re-lived what he had experienced.

Any kind of strong emotional situation or incident of a personal nature was a temptation for Disraeli to fall into the cheapest melodrama, as in the scene between Morley (who loves Sybil and is jealous of Egremont) and Sybil. "Who told you truth?" said Morley, springing to her side, in a hoarse voice, and with an eye of fire. "A friend," said Sybil, dropping her arms and bending her head in woe; "a kind, good friend. I met him but this morn, and he warned me of all this." "Hah, hah!" said

Morley, with a sort of stifled laugh, "hah, hah! he told you, did he? . . ." His taunts are more than the saintly girl can stand. "'Unmannerly churl!" exclaimed Sybil, starting in her chair, her eye flashing lightning, her distended nostril quivering with scorn.' Morley sees it all. "'Ah! she loves him!" exclaimed Morley, springing on his legs, and with a demoniac laugh.' A 'burning brightness now suffused the cheek of Sybil. "She loves him," exclaimed Morley, wildly, and he rushed frantically from the room.' It is only fair to say that such passages are rare in 'Sybil.'

Disraeli also often fails in his biggest dramatic moments. He is inclined to be flat and factual, and his transitions are strangely abrupt. The arrest of Walter and Sybil in the slum meeting-place is jerky and unsatisfactory; but the worst example is the final big scene when Mowbray is attacked and destroyed. It is jerky, hurried, and breathless, and needs reads more like notes than a finished product, as though Disraeli argued, 'Let's get this tiresome blood-and-thunder over quickly, and get back to politics and house parties.' His talent was not in this direction: he was not sure of himself.

Disraeli's characterisation is limited by his inability to create vivid visual images. One rarely sees his characters: they reveal themselves in their speech. Even here Disraeli has no great variety. He is at his best with the upper and cultured classes, especially when they reveal some aspect of his own character. Unfortunately Sybil, the central character, never comes to life. Her speech, as we saw from the quotation above, is theatrical and stilted. She is like Hudson's Rima, more a symbol than a person. She symbolises the Catholic Faith, the English countryside, beauty, womanhood, gentleness, courage, light—and is quite unreal. It is interesting to contrast her faith, which was idealised, with Hatton's worldly faith which Disraeli fully understood. Hatton is a Catholic; but he is very much a human being. Sybil is neither an authentic saint nor fully human. She is an abstraction. Though usually Disraeli's characterisation through speech is consistent, he sometimes makes his characters speak out of their part. It is doubtful if the rather cold and harsh revolutionary, Morley, would speak as he does to Sybil, or would make his theatrical dying oration.

As a novel 'Sybil' is patchy ; yet a certain spaciousness and serenity (partly derived from Disraeli's background) pervades the whole and gives it unity. Like most of his best work, it is memorable not so much for its art as for its ideas. In some aspects it might be regarded as a miniature History of England from the time of the Middle Ages, and of the relation between Church, State, and Community : Chapter V, Book II, for example, is a remarkable compression of this theme in a few pages. It is very pro-Catholic—and could hardly have added to Disraeli's popularity in those days. Perhaps he felt, apart from his reasoned beliefs, a fellow feeling with the religion that has shared with Judaism so much hate and misunderstanding. At one point in the book Gerard is asked by Egremont,

" " Yet if the monks were such public benefactors, why did not the people rise in their favour ? "

" They did, but too late. They struggled for a century, but they struggled against property, and they were beat. As long as the monks existed, the people, when aggrieved, had property on their side. And now 'tis all over," said the stranger ; " and travellers come and stare at these ruins, and think themselves very wise to moralise over time. . . . The monasteries were taken by storm, they were sacked, gutted, battered with warlike instruments, blown up with gunpowder. . . . Never was such a plunder. " "

If much of 'Sybil' is history, much more of it is a wonderful mirror of Disraeli's own times, now become history for us, but history written then at first hand, while it was being made, by a sensitive observer who was in the thick of it all. The contrast between the two nations is vividly brought out. We have seen that at the deepest level the division is between rulers and ruled. But in Disraeli's day the division of rich and poor was more obvious. We have progressed economically very far since then, in spite of two world wars : our richest men to-day are poor beside Disraeli's aristocrats and magnates ; our poorest live in luxury compared with Disraeli's industrial proletariat. Yet in spite of all this economic progress we are much nearer to the fundamental division of rulers and ruled ; and had Marxist tactics been as advanced in the Victorian era as they are now the division might have been

still greater. A revolutionary situation undoubtedly existed (already there were men like Morley talking the new totalitarian language), but it was due to the genius of such men as Disraeli that it was diverted to evolution.

In some ways the indictment in 'Sybil' is more convincing than the ideal. Disraeli's picture of the mining communities is vivid and terrible: the swarms of men 'wet with toil, and black as the children of the tropics'; the young women with their dreadful oaths who sometimes for sixteen hours a day haul and hurry 'tubs of coals up subterranean roads, dark, precipitous, and plashy'; and the infants of four or five, many of them girls, who open the air-doors of the galleries and spend hours in darkness and solitude.

His description of the town of Wodgate is hardly credible, yet must have been based on fact, so deep is the conviction with which it is written. It is the most remarkable and impressive chapter in the book. The inhabitants of Wodgate, though skilful craftsmen in iron-work—founders of brass and workers of steel, nailers and lock-smiths—were heathen in outlook and brutish in action, animals of gross and savage aspect. The town was without landlords, municipality, or magistrates, and was ruled by a bureaucracy of master-workmen—'nor is it possible to conceive one more oppressive. They are ruthless tyrants; they habitually inflict upon their subjects punishments more grievous than the slave population of our colonies were ever visited with; not content with beating them with sticks or flogging them with knotted ropes, they are in the habit of felling them with hammers, or cutting their heads open with a file or lock.' The whole population is drunk on Mondays and Tuesdays. Few people know their own age; few boys have seen a book, or girls a flower. The town is hideous, without tree or flower, belfry or steeple, or a single humanising sight or sound. The people are housed in miserable tenements, and the streets are never cleaned. Allowing for literary exaggeration, there must have been towns in England not unlike Wodgate. It was not directly a product of capitalism: it was an example of naked power without capital, naked power and gross indolence. This might have been the alternative to aristocracy had revolutionary ideas prevailed at that time, and it was this, above all, that Disraeli wished to avoid.

'Here,' he says, with profound irony, 'Labour reigns supreme.'

Disraeli brings out the attempts of the working classes to band themselves together in what to-day are unions, but in those days were more like secret societies run on a Masonic plan, with robed members and secret initiation rites. He seems to have favoured such societies; but his ideal would have approximated more to the guild than the modern trade union.

The claims of the aristocratic and democratic viewpoints are fairly put forward in 'Sybil.' Lord Valentine argues for the service his ancestors had given to the nation: they commanded the army and navy and made an island an empire; they shed their blood in battle; they planted trees, and raised churches, built bridges and roads, made mines and canals, drained marshes. In reply Morley points out that these things were done because the aristocracy were a monopoly. But, he asks, what of the people whose blood was also shed in battle, and who built the roads, and hewed the mines. 'You govern us still with absolute authority, and you govern the most miserable people on the face of the globe.'

Disraeli believed, as many of us believe to-day, that conservatism is the best ideal for England. Though often untrue to itself, and often moribund, 'it still lives in the thought and sentiment and consecrated memory of the English nation.'

'It has its origin in great principles and in noble instincts; it sympathises with the lowly, it looks up to the Most High; it can count its heroes and its martyrs; they have met in its behalf plunder, proscription, and death. Nor, when it finally yielded to the iron progress of oligarchical supremacy, was its catastrophe inglorious. Its genius was vindicated in golden sentences and with fervent arguments of impassioned logic by St John; and breathed in the intrepid eloquence and patriot soul of William Wyndham. Even now it is not dead, but sleepeth; and, in an age of political materialism, of confused purposes and perplexed intelligence, that aspires only to wealth because it has faith in no other accomplishment, as men rifle cargoes on the verge of shipwreck, toryism will yet rise from the tomb . . . to bring back strength to the Crown, liberty to the Subject, and to announce that power has only one duty: to secure the social welfare of the People.'

Disraeli believed in the ability of conservatism to renew itself and re-establish itself as a power in creating a new England. In conclusion we may consider some of the problems that are related to, and arise from, this ideal in the light of contemporary developments.

We have seen that the psychological forces behind the division of society into 'two nations' are broadly power and indolence: the desire for power in the rulers, indolence in the masses. These are the evil forces, never perhaps wholly transcended, but certainly, as history shows, capable of being checked. The ideals opposite to these two evil forces, ideals which have always inspired mankind, are *peace* and *economic prosperity*. In place of power and all its factions we need peace and stability: in place of indolence, which perpetuates dirt, poverty, ignorance, we need communal fraternity and effort directed towards economic prosperity. If, then, peace and economic prosperity are the ideals, how are they then to be brought about: how are we to check the forces of power and indolence, and at the same time bring about their opposites, peace and economic prosperity?

There have been many attempts to answer this question. Three of the most important in the modern world are socialism, capitalism, and what has been called distributism, or in its practical English form, conservatism. Socialism and capitalism are inadequate since they inevitably perpetuate power, socialism in the state, capitalism in the individual. Both foster indolence, the first by reducing the masses to well-fed serfs, the second through poverty. Neither seeks peace, but rather leads to war: class-war in the one, imperialist war in the other. Both are alike in having economic prosperity as the sole ideal, socialism ostensibly for the whole people, capitalism for a favoured class. Distributism, the diffusion of power by associations, balances and checks, and the wide distributions of property among families, guilds, and unions, is perhaps the sanest, and certainly the oldest of political ideals. It differs from socialism and capitalism in its psychological foundation and historical actuality. For thousands of years, while democracies, tyrannies, bureaucracies, dictatorships, have come and gone, men have sought to curtail power by checks and balances, and to

overcome indolence in the creative and individual initiative derived from the wide ownership of property. Time and again the experiment has been tried, with varying success, and time and again human wickedness has destroyed it. But the ideal is perennial, and in its English form is best embodied in conservatism which seeks to distribute power through the checks and balances of crown, government, church, law, and local associations, and to combat indolence through the initiative released by opportunity within this structure. Peace and prosperity follow—not the absolute peace and prosperity of idealist fanatics, but the peace and prosperity compatible with unregenerate human nature.

Now on the whole, England has been led by the conservative ideal for nearly two centuries; and it is noteworthy that during that time she has progressed fairly peacefully, and has had a higher standard of living than most other countries of the world. When Disraeli wrote 'Sybil,' over a century ago, the country was at the parting of the ways. The old order, based on the land, was being superseded by industrialism, which increased the rift between the two nations by dividing men, who had formerly been squires and agricultural labourers, into capitalist and proletariat. The question Disraeli asked himself, and posed in 'Sybil' was: can the conservative ideal survive the rift? Marx said emphatically no: the rift caused by capitalism must increasingly lead to class war, and the politics of class war is communism. Disraeli said yes: the conservative ideal can be reinvigorated and brought into line with the new conditions. A strong monarchy acting for the *people* (because it has nothing to gain from wealth or power) and acting as a check upon arbitrary government, an inspiring church, a vigorous aristocracy, and a people organised in unions and guilds, all balanced with each other, distributing power and increasing prosperity, could lead industrial England to great heights.

Some of this is old-fashioned. To-day the crown is more impersonal; the church is more personal; the aristocracy have merged into the people; a great deal of nationalisation has come to stay; and so on. But the ideal is as sound as when Disraeli formulated it. More than any other man of his time in England he gave new life and impulse to conservatism. To-day, when we are once more

at a parting of the ways similar to that in which he lived, a still more vital renewal of the conservative ideal is needed. If this renewal does not come, England is in for a hard time, as are also the countries of Europe, who will either follow the distributist-conservative ideal or go communist. But England is particularly fitted to lead the world on account of her past experience. The conservative ideal for which Disraeli stood is rooted in human psychology, and regards politics as an art. Socialism, capitalism, and the rest, increasingly tend to reduce psychology to economics, and make of politics a science. Economics and science have an important part to play; but human individuality is not susceptible to scientific investigation and treatment, and the successful politics of the future must be based upon the art of man. Of those who have been proficient in the art of man, Disraeli was supreme. We need his inspiration now more perhaps than ever before; and we need men like him, men of vision, of intellect and sensibility and subtle human feeling, and the common sense to make the most of all that is best in the modern industrial world.

ROBERT HAMILTON.

Art. 10.—POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

IN the issue of the 'Quarterly Review' published in April 1949, the writer described the change of government which took place in South Africa as a result of the general election of May 26, 1948. Dr Malan's new government, formed by a coalition between his own Nationalist party and Mr Havenga's Afrikaner party originated by the late General Hertzog in 1941, at once set to work to pass legislation generally popular among the European electorate: decreased taxation, the provision of white bread, repeal of the last government's Act providing for Indian representation in Parliament and in the Natal Provincial Council, abolition of family allowances for Indians, and the provision of separate railway coaches for non-Europeans on the trains in the Cape Peninsula. Such popular measures were essential and were passed without delay, because early in 1949 there would be an election of representatives for the provincial councils, and if Malan's party could win by a substantial majority his hand would be strengthened.

Though the activities of the provincial councils are confined mainly to legislation regarding education, hospitalisation, and roads, the Nationalist party decided to appeal to the electorate as it had done at the last general election on the non-European issue, i.e. on the Malan policy of 'apartheid' or separation of the white people from the non-white in certain definite spheres. Having won the general election with Havenga's help, Malan hoped that the two parties would fuse to form a united 'National' party and fight the provincial elections together.

Towards the end of 1948 however there was a strong disagreement between Malan and Havenga over the Ossewa Brandwag, but before going further into this some details of the development of this organisation must be given. The Ossewa Brandwag, or 'O.B.' as it is commonly called, is a secret society with a strong Afrikaans cultural background imbued with political aspirations. It came into existence in Bloemfontein, the capital of the Orange Free State, in October 1938, just before the centenary of the Great Trek, when, on December 16, the foundation stone of the Voortrekker memorial commemorating the Battle of Blood River was laid near Pretoria. 'Ossewa brandwag'

interpreted literally means 'ox wagon fire picket.' Like other secret societies, its members wear badges and are united for fraternal purposes, but unlike other secret societies there is a leader or Commandant-General with descending grades of rank and a disciplinary code.

Enthusiasm for the movement spread so rapidly that by August 1939 it was able to open a central administrative office in Bloemfontein. The O.B. promised to unify the Afrikaner people into an Afrikaner nation by providing festivals at which they could meet in voortrekker dress. Early in the history of the movement many members of the Nationalist party joined the O.B., but differences of opinion soon sprang up between the Nationalists and the O.B. and personal animosity between the two leaders, Malan and Dr J. F. J. van Rensburg, tended to divide the two movements. The O.B. opposed the entry of South Africa into the war on the side of Britain, but in October 1940 it went into an agreement with the Nationalist party whereby it undertook not to engage in subversive activities or use violence. This was known as the Cradock Agreement. During the war certain acts of sabotage were committed for which the O.B. was stated to be responsible, but the allegations were never proved. Later it was stated in Parliament * that Dr van Rensburg had made public declarations that the saboteurs during the war period would be the heroes of the future republic of South Africa and that he had admitted with pride that the activities of the O.B. were responsible for keeping a large number of soldiers in the Union, thus hindering the war effort.

On Aug. 23, 1941, van Rensburg in a speech at Brakpan expressed his contempt for party politics. Its truculence evoked from Malan an ultimatum demanding the withdrawal of a circular put out by van Rensburg on October 30. After this, attempts were made by prominent republicans, particularly the Rev. C. R. Kotze and Prof. L. J. du Plessis, to get the Nationalists and the O.B. to effect a compromise, but the breach widened, and on September 7 Malan was advising members of his party to resign from the O.B. Two leading Nationalists, Mr J. C. Strydom (now Minister of Lands) and General Kemp (formerly a cabinet minister

* Union of South Africa. House of Assembly Debates (Hansard), May 7, 1947. Mr Kentridge.

under Hertzog) resigned, and Mr Eric Louw (later of UNO fame) was expelled. On October 3 an urgent summons was made to all Nationalists to sever their connection with the O.B.

Meanwhile the Zeesen short-wave station which broadcast in Afrikaans as well as English to South Africa, and had up to that time pretended that the Afrikaners were united, now took van Rensburg's side in the dispute. After this feeling between the Nationalists and the O.B. became more bitter, and to-day there is little likelihood of a reconciliation unless van Rensburg should cease to remain leader of the O.B.

Returning to the disagreement between Malan and Havenga three months before the provincial elections, the O.B. wished to nominate its members as candidates for the Afrikaner party in these elections. Havenga, whose relations with the O.B. had for long been cordial, was in favour of this course, but Malan opposed it. In an exchange of correspondence between the two leaders which was published in the press during December 1948, Malan made it clear that he would have nothing to do with the O.B. as its leaders habitually preached their own ideology and aims which were in opposition to both the Nationalist and Afrikaner parties.

Though there is nothing unusual about the formation of pacts between political parties or groups which have little or nothing in common, especially when the support of the membership of one or other group would increase the chances of winning an election against a common enemy, in the Havenga proposed coalition (Nationalist—Afrikaner—O.B.) the circumstances were rather peculiar. Malan's party was by far the most powerful. Malan, himself premier, with a fairly loyal following of able colleagues, had no desire to 'import' into his coalition an alien element of O.Bs. whose object was to gain a foothold in Parliament and later get rid of Malan, ultimately to install their own leader as *fuehrer*. Havenga, on the contrary, as leader of the small Afrikaner party, was only too eager to admit O.B. members to his party in order to strengthen it, for the O.B. has a large membership, especially among the railway employees all over the country, who could be expected to win seats for the Afrikaner party at the provincial elections. Havenga refused to contest the provincial council seats if

the Nationalist party was to interfere with the nomination of his candidates. Van Rensburg declared that he knew that the Nationalists were not really fighting for white civilisation as they claimed, but only for the sole control of the Government.

Though the O.B. was the main subject for dispute between Malan and Havenga, there was another which for Malan was of vital importance. This was his decision to make the entrenched clauses affecting non-European franchise rights the main issue for the provincial elections. The entrenched clauses of the South Africa Act of 1909 were those which could not be altered by a bare majority of votes in the Assembly and the Senate but which required a two-thirds majority of votes by both Houses sitting together.

On Dec. 3, 1948, having taken legal opinion on whether, since the passing of the Statute of Westminster and the Status Acts, the Union Parliament was entitled to override the entrenched clauses, and having discovered that it was so empowered, Malan declared that his Government would make the entrenched clauses affecting non-European franchise rights the main issue for the provincial elections. Havenga, referring to the entrenched clauses in a speech, said that these safeguards were always respected by General Hertzog, and he was convinced that the national interest would not be served by departing from the old national Hertzog road and by following a new road without due regard to the explicit will of the people. Havenga's speech was applauded by some of the United Party newspapers, and on December 8, Smuts, addressing a meeting at Zeerust, praised Havenga for his disapproval of the plans of the Government to do away with Native representation with its slender majority.

Malan was therefore faced with the position that he could not proceed with his plans to introduce bills to eliminate the three Native representatives from the House of Assembly, whittle down Native representation in the Senate, or place the Coloured or half-caste voters on a separate roll during the ensuing session. These plans were important items in his 'apartheid' policy, but he was forced to abandon them, for without the votes of the Afrikaner party which still held the balance of power the Bills would be defeated.

At the general election of May 1948 the Nationalists won 70 seats, United party 65, Afrikaner party (with O.B. support) 9, and the Labour party 6. Though the United party lost the election, it polled 80,511 more votes than the Nationalist and Afrikaner parties combined. At the provincial elections, which were held on Mar. 9, 1949, in all four provinces, the Nationalists won 86 seats, United party 78, Labour 3, and Independents 3. It would require a complicated study of figures to determine whether the present Government gained or lost ground at the provincial elections as compared with the general election of 1948. At the provincial elections the Nationalists alone polled 7,413 more votes than the United party, but if the total voting strength of the parties were considered (including opposed and unopposed seats) United party votes would outnumber Nationalist votes by 106,087.

The present Government has now completed two sessions: the first from August to October 1948; the second from January to July 1949. During this period a great deal of important legislation has been passed, particularly the finance bills, Citizenship Bill, Electoral Law Amendment Bill, South West Africa Amendment Bill, and Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Bill.

The main feature of Havenga's finance bills was that in his first budget of August 1948 (his 'honeymoon budget' as the Opposition called it), there was a repeal of 20 per cent. surcharge on normal income tax and 25 per cent. on super tax. In his second budget of March 1949 a surcharge of 20 per cent. was reimposed on normal income tax and on super tax. The people who benefited from the short spell of remission of income tax comprised approximately 15 per cent. of the white population, for 85 per cent. of the whites and all but a handful of the non-whites are too poor to pay income tax at all.

In his first budget Havenga had been left by his predecessor, Mr Hofmeyr, with a surplus of 9*l.* million. The external debt stood at 8½*l.* million; the internal debt at 584*l.* million. It was stressed by the Opposition in the budget debate that the tax remissions, constituting as they did 'bonuses for the rich,' would increase expenditure on luxury goods, especially imported consumer goods from the U.S.A., thus enhancing the difficulties of dollar exchange. The criticism was justified by February 1949

when Havenga introduced the second reading of his Part Appropriation Bill. Introducing this Bill, Havenga expressed dismay at the lack of providence displayed by the people who, still floating on the tide of war-time inflation and with easy money to spend, considered that nothing was good enough for them. In this they were aided and abetted by sections of the commercial community who had overcommitted themselves to imports and were trying to transfer the burden to consumers.

Havenga explained that there was a great demand for basic services, such as transport, roads, water-power, and housing, for the development of the Free State goldfields, and for industrial development. To finance these services the Government had floated a loan, but it was not getting the money it needed. The financial institutions in the country had failed in their duty to the State. The position was that subscriptions amounting to 13*l.* million had been received, but an additional 6*l.* million were required. The debate on the Part Appropriation Bill was adjourned repeatedly from Feb. 24 to Mar. 23, 1949. In the interim Havenga read his second budget speech on March 16. By the time the debate on the Part Appropriation Bill had reached its concluding stages the Government loan had been fully subscribed.

In the second budget speech it was revealed that there was a surplus of 7½*l.* million. The net external debt had fallen slightly and stood at 8½*l.* million. The net internal debt had risen by 50*l.* million and now stood at 634*l.* million. Estimates of revenue for 1949-50 were assessed at 138*l.* million; estimates of expenditure to 140*l.* million. The deficit of 2*l.* million was to be met by the increase in taxation to which reference has been made and by several minor adjustments.

The South African Citizenship Bill was the most controversial and bitterly contested measure brought before the House since South Africa entered the war. The debate on it embodied speeches totalling approximately 600,000 words, equivalent in length to 7½ full-length novels. Dr T. E. Donges, Minister of the Interior, who piloted this Bill through its contentious stages, has behind him a brilliant academic record. He is moreover a debater of exceptional ability who can be suave, plausible, evasive, or forcible as expediency dictates. Behind these qualities there is in

his make-up a hard core of ruthless obstinacy in consonance with his germanic origin. He is the most potentially dangerous minister in Malan's Cabinet.

Among his preliminary remarks Donges stated that South Africa's relation with the Crown still existed and was acknowledged in this Bill in the oath of allegiance and in the recognition of the Commonwealth. Preferential treatment was accorded to citizens of the Commonwealth member states who wished to become South African citizens. The Bill merely gave expression to a new constitutional position which was already there.

There was, he maintained, only one class of South African citizenship but four ways of acquiring it : by birth in South Africa ; by descent from parents who were Union Nationals ; by registration, which applied to citizens of the United Kingdom, some other Commonwealth country, or the Republic of Ireland ; and by naturalisation, which was open to aliens.

The above description was however a deceptive oversimplification of the Bill which was complicated and confusing—in parts unintelligible. It consisted of five parts, forty-three clauses and two schedules. There was in fact a world of difference between the first two types of citizenship (birth and descent) and the last two (registration and naturalisation). Any person who was a South African citizen by birth or descent (as all the Nationalists were) could do more or less what he liked and say anything he liked without losing his citizenship. As members of the Opposition put it, he had a 'first-class ticket.' But anyone who had acquired South African citizenship by registration or naturalisation was in a totally different category. He had a 'second-class ticket' and could lose his citizenship in various ways, particularly if he displeased the Minister by his acts or words while away from South Africa.

The Bill was objected to on account of the following noxious clauses :

1. The grant of a certificate of registration to British subjects from other parts of the Commonwealth rested in the absolute discretion of the Minister who could, without assigning any reason, grant or refuse a certificate as he thought fit, and no appeal would lie from his decision.

2. The Bill failed to incorporate the common clause which appeared in the British Act of 1948 which laid

down that every citizen within the Commonwealth was a British subject or Commonwealth citizen.

3. The Bill did not make sufficient difference between citizens of the Commonwealth who applied for registration and aliens who applied for naturalisation. An alien had to wait six years; a Commonwealth citizen five years. (Before this Bill was passed a British subject automatically became a South African citizen or 'Union National' in two years.)

4. Full citizenship was given to all young Germans in South West Africa born since 1926, whose fathers in some cases were citizens of Hitler's Nazi state, while some of those who fought for South Africa and its freedom had to knock at the door like aliens.

5. It was laid down that the Minister had to be satisfied that the applicant for a citizenship by registration had an adequate knowledge of the responsibilities and privileges of South African citizenship. It was obvious from a speech by Dr Albert Hertzog, son of the late General Hertzog, that the main qualification any applicant would be required to have would be that his views on the treatment of Natives would have to be in accordance with the views of the Nationalists. Mrs Ballinger, a Native representative, asked that this clause should be dropped. On being pressed to explain how the clause would be applied, the Minister replied that he intended to get literature from Australia and Canada, and that he did not know whether the citizenship test would be written or oral—only that it would be an educational test.*

6. The Minister could deprive citizens by registration or naturalisation of their citizenship for a variety of reasons. In some instances he had to refer the matter to an inquiry by a judicial commission of not more than three persons appointed by himself, including a chairman who had to be a judge. The Minister was not bound to accept the finding of the Commission. One reason for deprivation of citizenship was that a person while outside the Union showed himself to be disloyal or disaffected to His Majesty. Opposition members suspected that the Minister interpreted the words 'His Majesty' to mean the Government of South Africa, or, as a Labour member aptly put it, 'His Majesty the Minister.'

* House of Assembly Debates. June 21, 1949. The Minister of the Interior.

Other features about the Bill to which the Opposition objected were the Government's steamroller tactics with use of the Guillotine to limit the time for debate, the frequent absence of the Minister from the House during an all-night session, his glib arguments and callous disregard of criticism, and the attitude of some Nationalists who revealed themselves in their true republican colours, referring to the Union Jack as a 'foreign' flag, 'God Save the King' as a 'foreign' anthem,* and maintaining that South Africa must remove all constitutional bonds with England.† Lastly, it was clear to the Opposition that the main reason why the Bill was being pushed through so hastily was that the Government, in anticipation of another general election at no distant date, wished to prevent as many immigrants as possible from getting the franchise which was linked up with citizenship. The Bill would deprive 30,000 immigrants of the right to become citizens after two years' residence in South Africa, as this number had arrived during the last two years. In one of the few lighter moments of debate Opposition members tried to persuade the Government that many immigrants would vote Nationalist, but a Nationalist member‡ incautiously admitted, 'The trouble is that they only read the English newspapers.'

Another of Donges's offensive bills was the Electoral Law Amendment Bill, passed by the present Government in 1948. Though less vigorously contested than the Citizenship Bill it was of importance as a means of disfranchising a considerable number of Cape Coloured men who still enjoyed the franchise in the Cape Province. By Clause 5 of this Bill it was laid down that any Coloured person wishing to register as a voter henceforth must appear before a competent witness, i.e. an electoral officer, magistrate, or police officer not below the rank of second-class sergeant. By the terms of this Bill, the 48,000 Coloured men in the Cape Province would have to approach the already overworked officials referred to above, of whom there are about 180. As many of the Coloured people are employed from early in the morning until late at night, largely on farms far distant from the

* House of Assembly Debates. June 14, 1949. Mr P. M. K. le Roux.

† House of Assembly Debates. June 14-15, 1949. Dr Look.

‡ House of Assembly Debates. June 20, 1949. Mr Brink.

main centres, this clause would in practice make it virtually impossible for many qualified Coloured persons to become registered. The motion that Clause 5 should stand part of the Bill was passed by 64 votes to 60.

Before describing the South West Africa Affairs Amendment Bill it is necessary first to summarise the terms under which the Union was given control of South West Africa. This took place at the Treaty of Versailles, South West Africa being classified as a 'C' mandate. As the Territory was closely connected with the Union, it had to be administered as an 'integral part' of the Union. A judicial commission appointed by the Union Government, the Van Zyl Commission, found that the words 'as an integral part' meant that South Africa could go to the utmost limit and absorb South West Africa as a fifth province of the Union. With the termination of the Second World War, the League of Nations, which was the Principal under which the Union acted as mandatory, disappeared. The United Nations Organisation was an entirely new creation, in the Charter of which no obligation rests on the Union to place South West Africa under the Trusteeship Council. Tremendous pressure has however been brought to bear at meetings of UNO to have South West Africa placed under its trusteeship. In 1946 Smuts asked UNO for permission to incorporate the Territory in the Union, though from a juridicial point of view UNO had no say in the matter. UNO took this request as acknowledgment of its right to refuse, which it promptly did. Smuts also, as a friendly gesture, sent a report to UNO on how the Territory was being governed. The Trusteeship Council expressed severe criticism of this report. The Council wanted to break up the Native reserves and destroy the tribal life of the Natives which has been so carefully preserved for thirty years after the disastrous German occupation. South West Africa under the Trusteeship Council, intent on detribalising the Natives, would be a source of constant trouble to the Union, for the tribal system is the one real advantage which the Natives still have.

The Bill which Malan introduced was intended to grant South West Africa representation in both the Assembly and the Senate. The representatives were to have limited voting powers. The mines and mining revenues in the

Territory were to be placed wholly under its administration. The Opposition opposed the Bill on the issue of mines and mining revenues, as no one knew what mineral wealth might yet be discovered in this vast desert territory, but were outvoted at a division by nine votes. It also objected to the principle of giving South West Africa representation without taxation and to the introduction into Parliament of a different kind of member with limited voting powers. Smuts moved an amendment that South West members should be admitted as ordinary members. This was accepted and it was resolved to appoint a commission to examine the financial position between the two countries.

The Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Bill, another of Donges's racial coups, was the outcome of Nationalist policy over a period of many years, and a measure which would clear the way for 'apartheid.' The Bill laid down that there was no legal provision for the contraction of marriages between whites and non-whites, and such marriages, if contracted, would be invalid. The Bill was opposed by the Opposition which, while agreeing that racial admixture was an evil, held that it could be dealt with by law. A division took place on the second reading of the Bill which the Government won by three votes, but Sir de Villiers Graaff, United Party member for Hottentots Holland, attacked the provisions of the Bill with such effect that he was actually able to induce the implacable Donges to move far-reaching amendments in the Committee stage, including one which provided that where a mixed marriage had been solemnised in good faith by a marriage officer, any children born before it had been declared invalid would be deemed to be legitimate.

It remains to sum up the trend of political events in the light of recent developments. The election of the Malan-Havenga Coalition is an outcome of two historic tendencies which have operated ever since white people first settled in South Africa. The Native, or 'Kafir' as he is usually called, was in early days the main enemy of the white settlers, and though he has been to some extent tamed, he is still essentially a savage. His behaviour is unpredictable; his conversion to Christianity never quite convincing. It has always been realised that he might at any time forsake his veneer of Western civilisation and again act as a savage. Thus the appeal of 'apartheid' in its several diverse forms.

The Afrikaner's earnest longing for a republic is a natural outcome in a brave and vigorous people, who since the very early days of South African history have been thwarted in their efforts to attain independence. It might be thought that the degree of independence already attained by this country would surely satisfy anybody, but this is not so. The South Africans of British descent are accused of having a divided loyalty, partly to South Africa but partly also to Britain, the land of their origin, and this is deeply resented by a large section of the Afrikaans people who have no land of their own but their beloved South Africa which even to-day is not completely their own. The link between the British Commonwealth and South Africa may be likened to a hawser, the strands of which are being severed one by one. The passing of some of the bills described above was designed directly or indirectly to cut or fray these strands.

The two historic trends—fear of the Native and desire for independence—are causing this country to become isolated from its friends: the civilised peoples of the Western world. There are two main dangers to be faced: the external and the internal. The external danger lies eastwards where Asia's millions are casting covetous eyes towards this seemingly vast area of living space. The internal danger is the steady increase in the prolific non-European population which cannot be counterbalanced by repressive legislation, 'apartheid,' or immigration. The poor soil and sparse rainfall of southern Africa are additional problems tending to render the solution of this un-united country's difficulties more serious.

It is not the purpose of this article to suggest a remedy for South Africa's ills, about which there is so much disagreement among politicians, for any such remedy would be so unpalatable that the majority of the people would refuse to swallow it. There is no acceptable specific remedy which could work a rapid cure. South Africa lacks a penicillin. Only palliatives and careful nursing could restore its high blood pressure and diseased coronary arteries to health, and the cautious therapy of Smuts—the policy of 'Let things develop'—is infinitely less dangerous than the present Government's convulsive shock treatment of passing contentious legislation by bare parliamentary majorities.

MICHAEL VANE.

SOME RECENT BOOKS.

- Dictionary of National Biography.** Edited by L. G. Wickham Legg.
Spain, 1923-1948. Arthur F. Love-day, O.B.E.
The Lamp of Memory. Desmond Chapman-Huston.
Colonial Civil Servant. Sir Alan Burns, G.C.M.G.
Correspondence of Emily, Duchess of Leinster (1731-1814). Edited by Brian Fitzgerald.
Craigavon: Ulsterman. St John Irvine.
A Life of John Keats. Dorothy Hewlett.
Piero della Francesca. Introduction and Notes by Roberto Longhi.
The Tragedy of Socialism. Ivor Thomas.
Fifty Year's March. The Rise of the Labour Party. Francis Williams.
Everyman's Encyclopædia.
The Drawings of W. Curtis Green, R.A. W. Curtis Green.
W. E. Henley. John Connell.
The Two Constitutions. Harold Stannard.
England, Yesterday and To-day. Edited by F. Alan Walbank.
The Canticle of the Rose. Dr Edith Sitwell.
European History 1648 - 1789. Robert M. Rayner.
Home Ground. Douglas Goldring.
Madame Récamier. Margaret Truncer.
Old Vic Saga. Harcourt Williams.

It is a truism that the 'Dictionary of National Biography' is indispensable for all students and writers of British history. It is also a lasting disgrace that no public honour was ever bestowed on George Smith who with patriotic enthusiasm and at great personal cost to himself founded it. The Oxford University Press and Geoffrey Cumberlege carry on the good work with its traditional skill and comprehensiveness. The latest volume, 1931 to 1940, edited by L. G. Wickham Legg, has now appeared, and like its predecessors is most welcome and worthy of all praise. One can open it anywhere and find something good and interesting, not only because of the subject but also because the name of the writer is added and it can be seen how skilfully the problem of *multum in parvo* has been tackled. We may take at random Sir Owen Morshead's instructive and dignified article on King George V, or Dr George Trevelyan's able article on Lord Grey of Falloden, or the Bishop of Durham on Bishop Gore, or G. M. Young on Rudyard Kipling, or Lord Elton on Ramsay MacDonald, or Sir George MacMunn on Lord Plumer, Geoffrey Callender on Lord Jellicoe, or, by way of contrast of subject, Dr Esdaile on Thomas J. Wise, skilled bibliographer and enthusiastic book collector but, alas, adept utterer of forged first editions. Horatio Bottomley also finds a place among the eminent. The choice is endless and the temptation to

go on reading overwhelming. A work so nobly conceived and so ably carried on through the years deserves all commendation and a place in every self-respecting library.

Mr Arthur F. Loveday's '*Spain, 1923-1948*' (Boswell Publishing Co.) should be read by all who are interested in present-day Spain and the events which have led up to her boycott by the United Nations. Nothing can alter the fact that geographically Spain is an essential part of Western Europe and that she is the keenest of opponents of Russian Communism. Unfortunately dislike of the Franco regime has become an obsession in many countries, especially those with left-wing governments. Interference with internal affairs in countries, unless they endanger world peace, is specially condemned by U.N.O.—but apparently this does not apply to Spain.

Mr Loveday gives clear, factual information, based on good evidence of what happened in Spain and in her relations with other Powers during the years covered by his book. He may perhaps be considered too partial to General Franco, though he admits his errors and past friendliness with Germany. But facts are facts and will prove how wide has been the misunderstanding of Spain, due largely to her apparently equivocal behaviour in the Second World War. The '*Quarterly*' with some other press organs has consistently supported the claim for Spain's return to the comity of western nations and has welcomed Mr Loveday's articles on the subject, and it therefore welcomes this illuminating book, but really the author should make up his mind about capitals. World War or world war, Christian or christian, Nationalists and Republicans or nationalists and republicans, Foreign Office or foreign office, Falange or falange, Captain General or captain general, and various other similar variations, sometimes both appearing on the same page.

'*The Lamp of Memory*,' by Desmond Chapman-Huston (Skeffington), might be better entitled '*Lamps*,' for there is in the book the glow of a whole row of lights of varied colour. The author was born and brought up in Western Ireland by a charming, quiet, kindly and deeply religious mother (to whom he was greatly devoted) and a father who was the antithesis of these qualities (and whom he cordially disliked). His mother wanted him to be a clergyman: his father wanted him to be little more than a

superior gamekeeper : he wanted to be neither. For a time he was on the stage with the F. R. Benson Company. Afterwards he had some interesting but most unprofitable years of stage production. Then he tried political life, till the First World War came and he turned into a soldier. After the war he tried a turn of welfare work and then at last found his lasting vocation in literature. He has known many eminent people in many walks of life, but perhaps his chief hero is Frederick, 1st Marquess of Dufferin. King Alfonso of Spain, the Royal Family of Bavaria, Ellen Terry, Lord Curzon, Sir John Cowans, Horace Vachell, Sir Louis Vaughan, Daisy, Princess of Pless, Lord and Lady Dudley, Lord Rosslyn, Henry Ainley, and Gordon Bottomley, are a random selection of friends of the author whom we meet in these pages. In places there is very outspoken criticism of people and events and the author does not pull his punches. But that all adds spice to an attractive and most readable work.

Sir Alan Burns is very well qualified to write a book like '**Colonial Civil Servant**' (Allen and Unwin), for not only were his grandfather and father in the Colonial Service but he himself began in it at the age of seventeen and continued actively in it till the age of sixty. He served in the Leeward Islands, Nigeria, the Bahamas, British Honduras, and the Gold Coast, being Governor of the last two (and for a time acting Governor of Nigeria). He also had a spell of duty in the Colonial Office in London, so can write with knowledge of both ends of the line, so to speak. He tells us of his own personal experiences in the various countries referred to above, but he greatly adds to the value of the book by his opinions on colonial administration in general, finance, wars and riots, industry, colour questions and prejudices, powers of Governors and Councils and Legislative Assemblies, native customs and superstitions, etc., with occasional very human touches as, for example, 'West Africa had not yet been invaded by the swarm of experts who later infested it, and spent much of their time criticising the work of those who had, of necessity, to make bricks without much straw,' or 'I can imagine nothing more deadening to a colony than Treasury Control.' This is an interesting and informative book on a subject which should be more deeply studied in this country than is usually the case.

'Coimísún Láimhscríbhinni na h'Éireann,' The Irish Manuscripts Commission, are to be congratulated on their enterprise in publishing the 'Correspondence of Emily, Duchess of Leinster (1731-1814),' edited by Brian Fitzgerald, Vol. I of which, covering the period up to 1774 and composed of letters of the Duchess herself, of her husband, the 1st Duke, and of her sister Caroline, Lady Holland, has lately appeared. It is claimed that 'the correspondence is a social and political document of peculiar value. There are few collections of letters which convey a more vivid impression of the eighteenth century in all its aspects. Moreover, these letters have the naturalness, the precision in detail, the diversity, and the self-revelation of the best letter writers.' This claim may be admitted, because in the case of near relations who were copious letter writers and lived in such places as Leinster House in Dublin, Carton, and Holland House, London, there were inexhaustible sources of Irish and English political and social gossip available. Holland House indeed was always such a well-informed centre, and Lady Holland adds to the variety by writing from Paris, Nice, and elsewhere on visits abroad. We range from, say, the political manoeuvres of William Pitt to the sadly tangled love affairs of the attractive Lady Sarah Lennox, from Court affairs to very minor bodily ailments. Over 600 large pages for volume I only is full measure and there is much to be said for more editing and less comprehensive treatment, which might omit much that is trivial, but that is only one point of view.

To read the work of Mr St John Ervine is always enjoyable because, joined to his undoubted literary skill, is a refreshing outspokenness of opinion which, to mix metaphors, never 'pulls its punches' and never lacks pungency, or courage. His latest book 'Craigavon: Ulsterman' (Allen and Unwin) has these virtues very markedly. The accent is really on Ulster for the work is largely a history of Ulster in the last sixty or seventy years and a presentation of the views, aims, convictions, and achievements of Ulster Unionists, of whom Lord Craigavon was so long the outstanding and much respected leader and champion. He was strong, rugged, and determined in feature and character, but was warm hearted and by no means the dour figure which he is so often painted. It was not till 1906

that he entered politics, first at Westminster and afterwards at Stormont, and indeed he was the creator of the Ulster Parliament and its Prime Minister of unchallenged authority for twenty years.

Mr Ervine must have enjoyed writing this tribute of friendship and admiration, but if we have a criticism it is that the virtues, courage, and nobility of Lord Craigavon are repeated and stressed so often that by half way through the book the reader will gladly take them for granted.

On the Dublin politicians, authorities, and the Roman Catholic hierarchy (with a few exceptions) Mr Ervine pours the full flood of his scholarly invective. Readers may turn to the criticism on Miss Macardle and her history on pages 333-34, and to the references to Mr de Valera throughout—they are indeed excoriating—and others are hardly more lightly treated. But many readers will feel that the book is altogether too long, nearly 700 large pages. Nothing is left to the imagination and the result tends rather to be like an over-exposed photograph. Some reduction would be an improvement, but the whole is a striking, skilful, and convincing piece of history and biography.

All great writers have a dual interest for mankind, in their writings and in their lives. Sometimes our knowledge of the one far surpasses our knowledge of the other; sometimes the interest of the one far exceeds that of the other; and occasionally it happens that interest and knowledge swing from the one to the other. This last has happened in respect of Keats. After years of neglect, he was ranked with Shakespeare, but little praised as a man: now few read him—except half-a-dozen poems at school—but nearly all talk about him. Modernists decry his work, but books continue to pour out about everything and every one connected with his life. Following closely on the great two-volume, 'The Keats Circle,' by Professor H. E. Rollins, of Harvard, comes a new and enlarged edition of Dorothy Hewlett's biography, now sensibly called 'A Life of John Keats' (Hurst and Blackett), with 'Adonais' as sub-title, instead of the other way about. This is an accurate, complete biography, not a great piece of literary scholarship, but a careful gathering together, finally, of all the facts. There is little of moment that is new in the new edition: the 'Amena' letter is no real

addition and the attempt of Charles Brown's granddaughter to whitewash him as to Abigail Donaghue is more praiseworthy than successful; and the bibliography is incomplete, omitting Marie Adami's important 'Fanny Keats,' published in 1937, Lady Birkenhead's authoritative biography of Joseph Severn, 'Against Oblivion,' published in 1943, Lord Gorell's illuminating 'John Keats: The Principle of Beauty,' published in 1948, and 'Keats, Shelley and Rome,' the Memorial Association's illustrated miscellany of 1949. But, nevertheless, Miss Hewlett's 'Life' is the most complete, the most authoritative that there is; and all lovers of Keats, if they do not already possess it in its original edition, will desire to obtain it now. But, oh, why must the publishers in their blurb speak of her as leaving Keats 'to tell his own story in his own delightfully racy idiom'? what a description of Keat's glorious letters!

Messrs Batsford have added to their beautiful Iris Colour Books series one on the famous frescoes of that unique painter '**Piero della Francesca.**' Twelve of the fourteen frescoes, here so faithfully reproduced from those in the Church of San Francesco in Arezzo and known as the Cycle of the Legend of the Holy Cross, have long been world famous as perfect examples of how paintings should be wedded to architecture. The two remaining frescoes are from the Communal Palace in Borgo S. Sepolero on the borders of Umbria and Tuscany where Piero was born, and where he spent several years of his artistic maturity. Few examples of Piero's work are to be seen in this country, probably the only authentic one being his well-known Nativity in the National Gallery. The peculiar qualities of this Umbrian painter, so manifest in the Nativity, are richly exemplified in the frescoes; skilled draughtmanship and perspective, dramatic grouping, colours rich yet subdued and, above all, the very rare ability to convey to the present-day spectator the exact quality and degree of emotion felt by those taking part in the great drama. The Introduction and Notes by Signor Roberto Longhi are, of course, admirable; the paper is good, the page worthily set out, the spacing in particular being admirable, and the type worthy of the illustrations.

Mr Ivor Thomas, formerly a keen member of the Labour party (until he realised whither it was heading) and now a

Conservative, has written **'The Tragedy of Socialism'** (Latimer House) as a statement of his own views and convictions and as an urgent warning, which indeed it is. His argument is that Socialism and Communism are inevitably making for the same goal, though by different roads—the former evolutionary and the later revolutionary. But as recent history and present events in many countries prove, when the stress comes it is Socialism that gives way, and thereby fails entirely to be a bulwark against Communism. This is ably illustrated by references to what has happened in other countries and what might happen even here, though admittedly Communist influence is so far but small. The crucial test comes with personal liberty. Already we have been deprived of many of our cherished liberties and now our Socialist Government has resumed war-time powers to direct labour. If planning requires that, we are heading straight for the totalitarian State. Doctrinaire planning carried to excess spells ruin, but too many of the Labour leaders seem blind to this. There lies the danger. Mr Thomas also shows how Socialism, if carried far, inevitably conflicts with human nature. The book is a useful warning.

After reading Mr Ivor Thomas' work it is instructive to turn to **'Fifty Years' March. The Rise of the Labour Party,'** by Francis Williams, with a foreword by the Prime Minister (Odhams). It was on Feb. 27, 1900, that, in the Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, the Labour Party was formed. It was an amalgam of Trades Unions, the Social Democratic Federation, the Independent Labour Party, and the Fabian Society, and all these influenced its growth and development. Who could have thought then that within 24 years it would provide His Majesty's Government, even though in a minority, and in 45 years be in power again with one of the largest parliamentary majorities on record. It was many years, in fact not till after the First World War that the party became definitely Socialist, though there was always a strong Socialist element in it, and the honour of the frontispiece in the book is given to Keir Hardie. The sections of the book give a good idea of its contents; the Years of Growth, Crisis and Conflict, Forward to Government, and the Road to Power. Crises and conflict have indeed been marked, especially during the First World War and in the formation of the

National Government in 1931, but in spite of set backs the march forward to power has been steady. Mr Williams gives just praise to the successive leaders, and equally just blame. Perhaps his chief hero is Arthur Henderson, while his most piercing criticism is kept for Ramsay MacDonald in his later years, and Snowden comes not far behind. Naturally Mr Williams sees the road of Socialism leading in a very different direction from that shown by Mr Thomas and, equally naturally, he writes with a strong Socialist bias, but he is fair in his treatment of opponents. There is much in the views expressed with which of course the 'Quarterly' strongly disagrees, but the story is well told, and it is the story of a notable struggle in which many resolute and honest men were—and are—engaged, though as with most causes the resolution is in some men more marked than the honesty.

How can anyone really review an encyclopædia in a few paragraphs? To do the work satisfactorily would require a book. The new revised and up-to-date first four volumes of 'Everyman's Encyclopædia' (Dent) are a case in point. Perhaps the fairest test is to turn up some subject about which one knows something and examine the correctness of the information given and then turn up at random some subject about which one knows nothing and see how well and how agreeably information can be imparted. 'Everyman' passes these tests with great honour. Obviously the information given must be condensed to the highest degree and there is no room for fine periods of literary effusion, but 'Everyman' is eminently readable and also amazingly comprehensive in its scope, as the beginning and ending of each volume suggest. In Volume II we find Balanoglossus to Bulford and in Volume IV Coal-fish to Drama. And what ordinary reader has even heard of Balanoglossus or of the class Enteropneusta from which it comes? This is the kind of work of reference which any student or indeed any educated reader may rejoice to have on his shelf. Messrs Dent are to be thanked both for the width of range of the volumes and for the accurate information which they contain. They should also be congratulated warmly on their enterprise in bringing out the volumes at a time when book production is so chancy and so costly.

Mr W. Curtis Green, R.A., has had a long and dis-

tinguished career as artist and architect and can look back on more than fifty years of active work. His sketches and drawings are outstandingly attractive, and Messrs Batsford are to be congratulated on persuading him to allow no less than 148 to be reproduced in the dignified and large quarto volume entitled '**The Drawings of W. Curtis Green, R.A.**' There is a complimentary foreward by Professor A. E. Richardson, R.A., and an autobiographical introduction by Mr Green telling of his family background, upbringing, training in the Royal Academy Art School, and elsewhere, work on '**The Builder**,' and subsequent launching into private practice, but the real attraction of the volume is of course the drawings, which take us not only to many parts of this country in pursuit of famous and beautiful buildings but also to Italy, France, Spain, and Belgium. The whole volume is a delightful possession to be kept and studied with profit and pleasure.

Mr John Connell's '**W. E. Henley**' (Constable) inevitably raises the question of what is Henley's true place among the eminent of literature, as poet, author, dramatist or critic. How much of or how little of his work was really first class and how much will, or deserves to, survive. He was beset by many handicaps: he was a cripple from boyhood, suffered much from ill-health, scanty education, and poverty—also from a needy family who looked to him for support which he could ill afford, though it must be admitted with regret that he was not slow to accept monetary assistance for himself from friends. Unfortunately the periodicals which he edited, including the '**Scots Observer**,' failed entirely to find success, but that may not have been his fault. He was an obstinate egotist and temperamental, as is shown by his quarrel with his former devoted friend R. L. Stevenson—but in that R. L. S. was just as much to blame. Henley's style was clear, well expressed, often trenchant, and sometimes in his letters irritatingly facetious and vulgar. We cannot help admiring a man who managed to make a full life in spite of such handicaps, but somehow all Mr Connell's skill fails to make us really like him. We can say that if it really is worth while resurrecting him from the limbo of the nearly forgotten to the extent of 400 pages, Mr Connell's book fulfils that purpose well and therefore deserves appreciative reading.

At a time when no intelligent citizen can afford to be without a working knowledge of the Constitution of the U.S.A. as well as of the British, and who may not have read Bryce's great work 'The American Commonwealth,' the publication of the late Mr Harold Stannard's '**The Two Constitutions**' (A. and C. Black) is invaluable. He starts off with the warning that, however one in source, spirit, and aim they may be, no Constitution deliberately written down in four months under the immediate pressure of events, and one that evolved over a period of four hundred years, can be alike in detail. Then, step by step, Mr Stannard lucidly and pithily compares one with the other. The book is simply and beautifully written. It teaches us as much about our own Constitution as it does about the American, and makes it clearer than ever that one country has little chance of a future without the other and, without both, Europe—indeed the World—has none. Admirable for the general reader, this slender study would make an excellent school textbook.

'**England, Yesterday and To-day**,' edited by F. Alan Walbank (Batsford), is a well-selected anthology compiled from extracts from writers between 1837 and 1937—from Dickens and Disraeli to Graham Green and Walter Allen. It deals with all sides of English life at home, at school, at work, at leisure, in the country, in the town, in Society, and in the slums. Luckily there is much more of yesterday than to-day, for to-day with all its drawbacks and shortcomings we have with us only too insistently, of yesterday we need to be reminded. For those who had health and wealth that yesterday held much security and many pleasurable advantages, for the under-dog it too often held neither security nor pleasure. All the same there were amusements in the Old Kent Road as well as in Mayfair. The extracts are embellished by about seventy carefully chosen illustrations which are really instructive as well as entertaining. The whole book is of informative value to the young and of nostalgic interest to the elderly.

'**The Canticle of the Rose**' (Macmillan) is the title of a new collection of Dr Edith Sitwell's poems representative of her work from 1920 to 1947. It confirms the belief that it is by assiduity and intensity of purpose, rather than by inspiration, that this unusual poet has won for herself a definite niche in contemporary poetry ; whether or not she

is too contemporary in spirit and outlook to join the small, high company of the immortals is, however, still an open question. No poet or writer has more consistently taken us into their workshop than Miss Sitwell. Almost continuously we see the hammer strike the anvil and, if the divine spark often eludes, that may be because of the noises by which it is accompanied. The earlier poems are, of necessity, experimental and were well named 'Façade'; brilliant exteriors, they never took you inside anything. Speaking of the early collection entitled 'Gold Coast Customs' Yeats wrote: 'I felt that something absent from all literature was back again'! That was indeed miraculous—for something that never was there to come back! But Dr Sitwell has been presented with many nose-gays by her fellow poets, the implication of course being that she writes for the cognoscente. Nor has she been ungrateful. She still observes the fashion, charming but outmoded, of dedicating personally single poems. When people love or praise her she richly rewards them with a song. It is odd that the poet has so often been accused of being anti-traditional, a contemner of outworn poetic phrases and obsolete 'poetic' words; yet she goes to the Song of Songs for her title and does not abjure such phrases as world's desire, red-gold hair, and far countree, or such enamelled words as fanfare, hornpipe, or oracles, while faded names such as Beelzebub, Midas, Apollo, and Psyche greet us from her pages like old familiar faces. That the brittle inventiveness of the group of poems labelled 'Façade' leads to the rich, freshly evocative texture of the 1940-1945 and 1945-1947 groups is remarkable. Amongst some poems touching greatness 'Mary Stuart to James Bothwell' is magnificent; its sweep, truth, intensity, its pregnant undertones and supreme craftsmanship combine to canonise it.

Mr Robert M. Rayner has taken the place of the late Sir John Marriott as a successful and popular writer of clear, factual, informative, and eminently readable history. His latest volume '**European History 1648-1789**' (Longmans) covers a period which, it is claimed, has not before been given a separate volume to itself. It was certainly a period of remarkable autocrats like Louis XIV of France, Elizabeth and Catherine of Russia, Frederick the Great of Prussia, and Maria Theresa of Austria. It was the age

of flowing and then ebbing tide in France, of the consolidation and aggrandisement of Prussia, of decay in Spain, of grouping and regrouping of the states in Germany, of chronic inefficiency in Austria, of confusion in the Low Countries, and alternate success and failure in Holland. In the period, too, were included Marlborough, Eugene, Saxe, and Turenne. It was the age when monarchs treated their countries like private estates, to be managed, increased, or bartered entirely as the owner desired. It was the age of many campaigns and much complicated and often dishonest diplomacy. Mr Rayner tells his story with admirable lucidity, balance, and restraint, and students will find the book exceedingly useful.

In 'Home Ground' (Macdonald) Mr Douglas Goldring gives a pleasantly discursive account of a tour made, chiefly by bus, through parts of southern and midland England in 1948. Starting from Kent he went to Dorset, Salisbury, Chippenham, Gloucestershire, Warwickshire, Lichfield, Nottingham, Stamford, Rutland, Peterborough, Huntingdon, and Bedford. Obviously none of this is new ground, but Mr Goldring treats it all in the spirit of exploration, and enjoys byways and little human touches. He is a keen and instructed student of church architecture and a good guide to churches (though he does not say whether he attended services in them). He is an equally keen and instructed admirer of good food and good beer, and is therefore a good guide to hotels and inns, and also pubs, for in each place he went the round to get local atmosphere, hear local talk, and gather local opinions—not forgetting to enjoy refreshment while doing so. Occasionally he gives rein to his left-wing views with which many readers will disagree, as with his eulogy of the Dean of Canterbury. Otherwise the book makes pleasing and instructive reading.

Margaret Trouncer, who has won deserved success with her historical novels, has in 'Madame Récamier' (Macdonald) turned to straight biography, with some picturesque adornments. Juliette Récamier is an interesting subject. Born of upper middle-class parents in Lyons, she was married when still a girl to a kindly but selfish banker, old enough to be her father. In fact she was his wife in name only and they later drifted apart and led entirely separate lives. Juliette with her great beauty and personal charm

had an immense attraction for men, from aristocrats like Prince Auguste of Prussia, Adrian Prince de Montmorency and his cousin Mathieu the Duke, to writers like Constant or the humble and much more attractive Ballanche. She enjoyed all the outward signs of devotion but wished to keep the friendships Platonic—at any rate until the coming of the odious Chateaubriand, whose mistress she was for a short time, though the close friendship endured till the end of their lives, in spite of his blatant infidelity. Her literary salon in the Abbaye-aux-Bois was famous for many years and attended by many famous people. There Chateaubriand's *Memoirs* were read aloud to a suitably admiring (at any rate outwardly) circle. It is for her much-vaunted beauty and her salon that Madame Récamier is remembered now, but Mrs Trouncer gives a complete and convincing picture of her life, drawn with skill.

Few people could be better equipped than Mr Harcourt Williams to write 'Old Vic Saga' (Winchester Publications). Saga is perhaps hardly the ideal word for something so essentially English that it 'just grow'd.' But it did not grow without much human blood, sweat and, often enough, tears. Here we have not only the essential facts, but the whole human story. From Quaker-like Emma Cons, who began the work in 1880, and her niece Lilian Baylis, to the glamour of Sir Laurence Olivier is a long way and, possibly, the wrong destination. The compilation of such a record is arduous and lists of plays, producers, and casts apt to bore, but Mr Harcourt Williams has skilfully avoided all the pitfalls, and his immense knowledge, and deep sympathy with the thousands of workers who helped to build this great enterprise, keep his narrative alive. The author, who was himself a brilliant and successful producer at the Old Vic from 1929 to 1933, naturally finding himself at a disadvantage when discussing the work of other producers, largely eschews criticism. Had he felt free to indulge in appraisal of all concerned with this fine adventure his book would have perhaps aroused annoyance or even resentment, but it would have had deeper significance and greater historic and literary importance. Within its chosen limits it is invaluable.

